THE SAINTS

The Saints

SAINT ANTONY OF PADUA

Nihil obstat

HENRICUS G. S. BOWDEN, Cong. Orat.
Censor deputatus

Imprimatur

HERBERTUS CARDINALIS VAUGHAN
ARCHIEPISCOPUS WESTMONASTERIENSIS

Die 28 *Februar*, 1902.

SAINT ANTONY OF PADUA

(1195-1231)

BY

M. L'ABBÉ ALBERT LEPITRE

TRANSLATED BY

EDITH GUEST

ALMA COLLEGE
270.05
LIBRARY
P136
Alma, California

ALMA COLLEGE
LIBRARY
Alma, California
SAN JOSE

LONDON

DUCKWORTH & CO., 3, HENRIETTA STREET, W.C.

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI & CHICAGO:
BENZIGER BROS.

DUBLIN:
M. H. GILL & SON

1902

3095

Authorised Translation
All Rights Reserved

PREFACE

AFTER many vicissitudes, the cultus of St Antony of Padua has undergone marked development at the close of the nineteenth century, and to-day this Saint is more popular than ever before. His images are to be found in a multitude of churches and sanctuaries in both hemispheres, and believers throng before his image to ask his intercession or to thank him for the favours they have already obtained. The devotion which inspires them must needs suggest to them the desire to become acquainted with his life, and learn to know him in more intimate and complete fashion. But it happens that not one of the monographs which have been devoted to him in our own day are equal to the legitimate requirements of modern hagiography. Their compilers have not taken the trouble to go back to the original authorities, and the later comers have been satisfied with summarising or perhaps embellishing the works of their predecessors. Several have copied Wadding; others have drawn from the collection of the Bollandists, but without making any distinction between the documents of very different value gathered together by those doughty investigators; exceedingly rare are those who have troubled to read biographies like

Azevedo's, which is, however, so deficient from the critical point of view. As for Dr Edward Lempp, who has published such remarkable articles dealing with our Saint, and has cleared the ground on which we must henceforth build, he has made no pretence of writing a real biography, and the public has never dreamt of seeking his work in the German Review where he has published it.

St Antony's life thus needs not only to be written again, but the edifice must be rebuilt from the foundation-stone; it was with this object in view that we began and finished our work. We have thought it needful to go back, first of all, to the original authorities, and not to trust to the Antonine biographers without first considering the degree of authority which belongs to each of them. Only then did we see how difficult our task was.

They are fortunate who, engaged in writing a biography, have all the requisite material at their disposal, and have merely to incorporate it in their own work. They examine it with all necessary care; then, when they have lived, as it were, in the Saint's company, they combine all the most trustworthy information about him, and give us his portrait full of life and, of course, full of interest. Our readers have met with lives thus compiled in this collection of "The Saints." But for ourselves, our task has been made peculiarly difficult by the dearth of original documents. Those we do possess give us no intimate idea of St Antony's personality. This is, as a rule, because the men who wrote the lives of the first Saints of the Franciscan Family were

not interested in the same point of view as ourselves. They thought not so much of describing the holy man's entire life as of compiling the story, in the strict sense of the word: we mean, putting together a narrative meant to be read in public, in the refectory or the chapter-house, sometimes even intended to be cut up into portions of equal length to furnish lessons for the Breviary. When facts were few, the author took little trouble to make further inquiries: he lengthened out his exposition by rhetorical devices, and by imparting more pomposity to his sentences. We have noticed this proceeding in the earliest biographers of our Saint. He whose version seems to be the earliest declares that he collected his information from various persons, among whom he mentions Soeiro Viegas II., Bishop of Lisbon, and yet what he tells us of Antony's childhood and youth is most inadequate.

Moreover, what chiefly interested the men of the thirteenth century was a very different thing from what interests us to-day. In the life of a Saint our ancestors mainly desired an account of his miracles. And no doubt even now we still like to read the stories concerning them. But above all else we are interested in the psychology of the Saint, that is, in all which affords us clearer comprehension of his mind, his character, his struggles with himself, his efforts after perfection, his whole soul. We are quite ready, for instance, to forget the miracles performed by St Theresa: but we can never read without emotion that wonderful autobiography in

which she reveals so fully her great soul. As it happens, St Antony chiefly impressed himself on the imagination of the people in his character of a miracle-worker: immediately after his death he worked so many miracles at Padua that the Sovereign Pontiff did not even wait one year before canonising him. The first biographer, who had before him an official document in which were narrated the miracles instanced in favour of his canonisation, fortunately mentions them at the end of his actual biography; he must therefore have regarded his life of Antony as quite complete, and leaving nothing more to be desired. Those who have followed him most closely have done exactly the same, adding other miracles not mentioned by him: but they have said never a word which would really make us better acquainted with his soul and his life.

Lacking copious biographical information, an author is fortunate when he can make use of his Saint's own writings. His attitude may be more or less subjective, that is, he may speak openly of himself, as does St Theresa, or may be quite silent concerning the events of his own life, as is St John of the Cross. But however it may be he cannot choose but reveal somewhat of his own soul. Unfortunately here again we have not been able to draw upon any source of information as abundant or as reliable as we could have desired. Among the writings handed down to us under the name of St Antony of Padua, a certain number are not by him at all. As for those commonly regarded as authentic,

they give but a faint idea of what he must have been as a preacher; they are merely summaries, full of texts, but with the eloquent outpourings concerning them usually omitted altogether. We cannot see in them the likeness of the apostolic man whose influence upon the people was so extraordinary.

Along with these early documents of which we have spoken, we have others of later origin. It would have been rash to reject them *en masse*, and besides, we felt we must speak of them to our readers, to warn them and put them on their guard against those works written without any critical judgment which we mentioned above. But such reservations necessitated discussions, or at any rate explanations: consequently our work has assumed a character which perhaps will not please all our readers. Those who love an eloquent and comprehensive account in which the facts are all presented in clear and luminous array, may deem our work too difficult to read and will regretfully recall those monographs of which they retain admiring memories. It is just to warn such against possible deception that we have desired to explain the real state of the case with regard to St Antony's life, and to show what it actually is possible to find out concerning him. We are confident they will pay heed to these explanations, and will understand how we have been obliged to arrange our book.

For the learned, who are conversant with the beginnings of the Franciscan Order, and those who have studied St Antony particularly, they are aware of all the subject's difficulties, and there is no need

to offer them apologies. Several of them have been good enough to write and express approval of our undertaking, and send us the most encouraging words of sympathy in our task.

But after all, in spite of the patience and care we brought to our work, the figure of St Antony does not stand out in our book in all the relief we wished to impart to it. We could not, just to make the picture more complete and more impressive, preserve certain details which other hands, by no means too scrupulous, had no hesitation in ascribing to him. To have done so would have been to fail seriously in our duty as a historian. As we have finally disengaged it, the Saint's image is not unlike those mediæval frescoes, distorted by successive restorings, which very careful scraping has at last brought back to their original simplicity and truth.

In any case we have been able to retain for him his miracle-worker's aureole, which assures him the worship and homage of so many believers.

After these explanations we trust this book will have a sympathetic reception from many readers. They will perhaps feel grateful to us in that we have toiled, to the extent of our ability, to make them better acquainted with the Saint whom we all reverence, even if the knowledge we can give is not equal to the extent of their desires. Having read our book, they can maintain this fact: even if St Antony were not the miracle-worker whose aid they invoke, he would remain worthy of their adoration. We should still admire in him the young man of noble birth who

early enters the cloister to find a shelter for his purity, the Canon Regular wholly devoted to the study of sacred lore, the son of heroes who presses forward to martyrdom, the Franciscan Brother eager for penance and austerities, the evangelic worker who drew crowds to him: and all these characteristics, taken together, would still present the noble picture of a Saint.

Before we end we gladly acquit ourselves of the sweetest of duties. A humble son of the Catholic Church, we have ever gloried in submitting ourselves to her in all we think and write. Therefore we declare in obedience to the decrees of Pope Urban VIII. that in writing this book we have never had the slightest intention of forestalling the judgment of the Holy See: we give our adherence beforehand to everything it may decide, professing what it professes, rejecting what it rejects.

We have yet another task, to thank in heartfelt manner all those who in different ways have been good enough to help us in our work. Our gratitude is due first and foremost to Dr Ed. Lempp, who kindly sent us his articles on St Antony; to M. Paul Sabatier, who lent us books hardly to be procured now; and finally to Father Ferdinand Marie d'Araules, the Franciscan, who has done us a like service, whose fine sympathy has never failed us in the course of our labours.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

SAINT ANTONY'S ANCESTORS 1

CHAPTER II

AMONG THE CANONS REGULAR OF ST AUGUSTINE 13

CHAPTER III

WITH THE FRANCISCANS 28

CHAPTER IV

ST ANTONY'S ENTRANCE INTO PUBLIC LIFE . 56

CHAPTER V

ST ANTONY IN FRANCE 70

CHAPTER VI

RETURN TO ITALY 94

CHAPTER VII

PAGE

ST ANTONY'S WORK IN PADUA . . . 122

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEATH, FUNERAL OBSEQUIES, AND CANONISATION OF ST ANTONY—CONCLUSION . . 160

APPENDICES 177

SAINT ANTONY OF PADUA

CHAPTER I

SAINT ANTONY'S ANCESTORS

THE Saint, whose life we are endeavouring to present, bears the name of the city of Padua, because he died there, and his relics are preserved there. But he was born at Lisbon, in the kingdom of Portugal, "which is situated at the extremity of the earth," the original legend tells us.[1] For, to the Italians of that time, this was a far-distant country, which you could hardly reach except by following the land-route, that is to say, by crossing through France and Spain.

It is not our business here to tell of the rise of this young kingdom, at first Castille's vassal-state, but declared finally independent in 1169, when Count Alphonso Henriquez was recognised as king by Pope Alexander III. It was this prince

[1] By this title we shall always refer to the version published in the *Portugalliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores*, vol. i., Lisbon, 1856. If we have to record details peculiar to the texts edited by Father Josa, Father Hilaire de Paris, or to the *Vita Auctore Anonymo* of the Bollandists, we shall not fail to note the fact. We beg our readers to be good enough henceforward to refer to Appendix I., where we discuss the varying degrees of authority of the documents consulted.

who took Lisbon in 1147, with the assistance of a fleet of Crusaders who were on their way to Palestine. When he died, in 1185, his son Sancho I. occupied himself—this it is which has earned him the title of Poblador—in dressing the wounds, still bleeding, which plague and war had dealt his kingdom. Not content with repeopling the towns, distributing estates and getting his subjects to agree to clear them, he fostered all that might regenerate his people, and especially the Catholic religion. Our Saint was born in 1195,[1] under this restorative régime. We know that he received the name of Fernando, and that at his birth his parents were still very young. We learn besides that their home was on the west side of a huge church dedicated to the Virgin Mary, and venerated also because it contained the body of St Vincent, the martyr of Valencia. This is all we know for certain concerning the ancestry of the Saint, and we regret extremely that the author of the original legend did not push his curiosity further, and make inquiries from the bishop of Lisbon, Soeiro Viegas II.[2]

The chronicler Rolandino tells us that the Saint's

[1] This is the almost unanimous view of the Saint's biographers. We know that he died in 1231, and that he was thirty-six years old. As regards the more exact date, the 15th August, there is no certain warrant for it, although it is accepted by Emmanuele de Azevedo, *Vita di Sant' Antonio di Padova*, p. 337, 4th edition, Venice, 1818.

[2] He was consulted by the author of the original legend. *Cf. Op. cit.*, p. 116. He died Jan. 29th, 1232, we are told by Father H. Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitaeten des Mittelalters*, vol. i., p. 283, note 1.

parents were "noble and powerful," and we have no reason to suspect his evidence.[1] Our doubts begin with the assertion of Surius, according to which Fernando's father was called Martino, and was a soldier of King Alphonso, whilst his mother's name was Maria.[2] But in any case this is a detail of trifling importance, and we do not care to stop over it. Let us consider other statements concerning the family of our Saint.

And first let us reject Arbusti's, who tells us that his family name was Dason. In this he relies on Ongarello, who himself invokes the testimony of a distinguished foreigner, a relation of the Saint's, from whom he obtained this detail. All that Ongarello says seems invented at his own pleasure, and we are unwilling to waste time in refuting the tale he tells us.[3]

But we must examine the view, so widespread amongst the Antonine biographers of our own times,

[1] *Cf.* the quotation we make from Rolandino, p. 138, and the note on p. 139.

[2] *De probatis sanctorum vitis, . . . R. P. Fr. Laurentius Surius Carthusiae Coloniensis professus primum edidit.* Coloniae Agrippinae, 1618, vol. vi., pp. 188-196. It has been suggested that the word "miles" should be here translated by "knight," which seems to us sufficiently correct. Obviously Alphonso II., who reigned from 1211 to 1223, is here spoken of.

[3] We have not before us either Arbusti's work, *Compendio cronologico e critico dei fatti e scritti della vita del glorioso taum. S. Antonio in Padova*, Bassano, 1786 (this book seems impossible to procure now), or that of Ongarello, whose *Cronaca di Padova* has unquestionably never been printed. We know the statements made by them through Azevedo, pp. 327-330, Dissert. III. Azevedo is a very imperfect critic, but a conscientious reporter.

that connects our Fernando with a family named Bouillon, said to be no other than that of Godfrey, the leader of the first Crusade.

Mark of Lisbon it is who was the first to state definitely that the Saint's father was Martin de Bouillon. His work, the first part at any rate, appeared in 1556.[1] This testimony comes very late: is it at least supported by genuine documents? The author has not taken the trouble to mention them. Without stopping further over the biographers who have repeated this assertion, word for word, or in slightly different form, we come to Azevedo, who defends it at length, relying mainly on a manuscript which had been sent to him by a Canon of Lisbon.[2]

The documents on which this manuscript was based are no longer in existence, or at least no one has been able to come across them. It states there that the surname Bulhom or Bolhom is the ordinary translated form of the Lorraine name of the Bouillons: a point for which there is no proof whatever.[3] All the persons who have the patronymic

[1] It is very difficult to procure the original edition of his work, and we have only been able to consult a French translation, *Chronique et institution de l'ordre de S. François*, Paris, 1608. But the date is given us by Dr Eduard Lempp, in his extremely conscientious and learned study entitled *Antonius von Padua*, in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, of Brieger; *cf.* vol. xi., p. 205. We shall often have recourse in the rest of our work to Dr Lempp's luminous suggestions, though without always blindly adopting his conclusions.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 327-335 and 515-528.

[3] It goes on to suppose that the forms Bulhan, Bulhão, Bolhão, Bulhões, Bulhoens and Bolhões, which we find in the different writers, point to one family, the Bouillons, the attempted justifica-

Martins (in Latin *Martinus*) are taken as belonging to the same family, a matter it would be likewise necessary to prove. Among these Martins, there are some who have also another name, which is not always Bulhom: one of them is called da Verga, another de Pajam, a third Serrano. We cannot but ask why all these Martins, if they really belonged to the Bouillon family, omitted to take this name in public transactions, and even exchanged it for another which seems certainly to have been less illustrious.

tion being that at this time not much care was taken in transcribing names exactly, which also needs to be proved.

The armorial bearings of Martin Bulhom and Tareja Taveira, his wife, have been given by several writers, and do not advance the discussion in the least. Those of the former are, argent, a cross gules, each arm of which is finished by three sinopled acorns with cups or; surmounted in place of a crest by a St Andrew's cross also gules, finished with acorns of the same, with ornaments or at each extremity. The arms of Taveira are, or, with nine torteaux gules, in rows of three. The helmet which serves as crest is surmounted by a lion or, shaded gules, and charged with nine torteaux of the same. These armorial bearings of the Bulhoms of Portugal prove nothing about the question which is occupying us, since they differ from those of the Bouillons of Lorraine and of Luxembourg. We find these arms in authors too recent to be regarded as authorities, such as M. Pacheco, *Epitome de la vida de Sant' Antonio*, Madrid, 1647, and Santes Bordegati, quoted by Azevedo, *op. cit.*, p. 334. In regard to the testimony of the genealogists of the eighteenth century, that is of still less weight, because they belong to still more recent times, and they afford us no fresh proofs. This is our view of the credibility of the German writer, Elias Reusner. He gives Godfrey de Bouillon a son who, "it is believed, emigrated to the Spanish peninsula, where he died in 1148." Where did he find this detail? *Cf.* F. A. Carlos das Neves, *O Grande Thaumaturgo de Portugal, Sto Antonio de Lisboa*, vol. ii., ch. iii., Porto, 1899.

As to those who make our Saint a grandson or great-grandson of Godfrey de Bouillon, their statement is much more improbable still. The first king of Jerusalem died in the year 1100, and, as he had no offspring ready to receive his crown, his brother Baldwin became his successor. If he had had a son in Portugal, would it not have been natural for him to summon him to come and receive his crown? Besides, see how those who have imagined this point explain the presence of the Bouillons in Portugal. In the year 1147, Alphonso Henriquez, the first king of Portugal, besieged the town of Lisbon, then in the hands of the Mussulmans. They resisted bravely, and it seemed as if the siege would last a long time. In his desire of finishing the conquest of the town promptly, he asked help from an army of Crusaders from Germany, France and England, who were going to Palestine. He had little trouble in persuading them, especially after he promised them substantial gains if they were victorious. Lisbon was taken in the month of October, and pillaged by the Crusaders. In addition, several of their number at their request were given apanages and settled permanently in Portugal. One of these Crusaders, they add, belonged to the Bouillon family. They even assert that his name was Vincent, that he was governor of the fortress of Lisbon, and that his son was Martin, our Saint's father.[1] We should have

[1] Here we find a disagreement between M. Pacheco and Cornejo. The title of governor of Lisbon is given by the former to Martin, whilst the latter gives it to Vincent. *Cf.* E. Salvagnini, *S.*

no objections to raise against all this if supported by any well-substantiated evidence, but there exists no such thing. The earliest chronicle in which this expedition is mentioned gives us the names of four nobles who were thus rewarded with land: we do not find any Bouillon mentioned.[1] This view is therefore found to be merely an hypothesis, for which various persons have endeavoured to secure acceptance by connecting it with a glorious deed of arms in the reign of Alphonso the First.

Other writers, less numerous than those whose opinion we have just considered, place the arrival of the Bouillons in Portugal at a still earlier date. A member of this family is thus supposed to have been among the French nobles who came and offered to Alphonso VI., King of Castille and Leon, the aid of their weapons against the formidable invasion of the Almoravides from Africa. Just as this king rewarded Raymond of Burgundy by giving him the hand of his daughter Urraca, and Henry of Besançon by bestowing on him his other daughter Teresa, not omitting to give his two

Antonio di Padova e i suoi tempi, p. 8. Torino, 1887. We must observe here, as we shall have to on more than one future occasion, that the assertions of these seventeenth century authors are often based on the merest conjectures.

[1] *Cf.* in the *Portugalliae Monumenta historica*, vol. i., the *Cronicas breves e Memorias avulsas de S. Cruz de Coimbra.* There the story of the taking of Lisbon by Alphonso I. is narrated (page 29). The four leaders mentioned are Dom Guilhim de Licorne, Dom Rooim, Dom Juzbertez and Dom Ligel. These names are obviously corrupt in their spelling: but not one of them could possibly be connected with the Lorraine name of Bouillon or the Portuguese one of Bulhom.

sons-in-law, by way of dowry, huge estates, in similar fashion the ancestor of the Portuguese Bouillons is supposed to have been endowed with a rich lordship.[1] But we should then require to know where this lordship was, and that name could not be given to the estate which the Bulhoms owned at the gates of Lisbon. This supposition is no more probable than the former one, and we do not care to stop any longer to discuss whether our Fernando was descended from the Bouillons of Lorraine.

Our Saint's mother, if we may here accept the evidence of Surius, was of noble birth, like her husband, and was called Maria. But later historians would not be content with this brief description: they have made out that she was named Tareja Taveira, or Maria Tareja Taveira, and that she was descended from Froïla I., the fourth king of Asturias.[2] Let us leave to these writers the responsibility for their statements, which are nothing but conjectures. Neither have we any more adequate reasons for conceding that Fernando had a brother called Pedro, and two sisters, Maria,

[1] It is this Henry of Besançon, who became Count of Porto in 1093, who was the father of Alphonso I., first count and afterwards king, of Portugal. The Count of Porto was naturally Castille's vassal.

[2] Certain writers, who are however in the minority, state that Fernando's mother was called Teresa de Azevedo. This is yet another statement which is in much need of proof. *Cf.* F. A. Carlos das Neves, *O Grande Thaumaturgo de Portugal, Sto Antonio de Lisboa*, vol. I., p. 21. We place this book under contribution several times because we have found in it quotations from very rare works, which we have never been able to procure for ourselves: but the biography itself is very imperfect.

who is supposed to have been canoness in the Augustine Monastery of St Miguel, at Lisbon, and Feliciana, who is said to have married, and her son Apparicio to have been restored to life by St Antony.[1] After all, the settlement of the question of the Saint's parentage is of quite secondary importance. He can dispense with nobility of birth, he who was destined to win, by his virtues and by his works, such glorious fame within the Church. But we did not like to overlook any details which have attracted the attention of the Saint's most recent biographers.

The earliest life adds that he was sent to the school belonging to the cathedral-church, near which his parents lived, and that there he was taught by priests. The author cited in evidence by Azevedo to prove that Fernando was one of the Martins de Bouillon declares that the only master at the church-school was a canon, an uncle of the Saint himself, called Fernando Martins. We have already said what we think about his credibility, and on this point we do not think it any greater than on all the others.

We should have been far more glad to have had

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 253-320. *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 515-528, et J. Cardoso, *Agiologio Lusitano*, vol. iii., p. 676, Lisboa, 1666. This incident about the raising from the dead of a nephew of Antony's is related twice in the *Liber Miraculorum*, pp. 142 and 145 : in the first account, the child is called Parisius, and only described as a relation of our Saint. It is Cardoso who gives us the name Apparicio ; but his evidence has still less weight than that of the *Liber Miraculorum*. We quote this last work from the text inserted in the *Chronique des XXIV. Généraux*, and published in the *Analecta franciscana*, vol. iii., pp. 121-158. Quaracchi, 1897.

details concerning the way in which instruction was then given to Portuguese boys. We should then have been able to judge what influence it exerted on the development of the future preacher, and to watch the first dawning of the gift which was destined to enthral multitudes. If we might hazard a conjecture based on probability, we should say that the lessons at the Lisbon cathedral must have been very similar to those being given in the schools of the same kind in other parts of Catholic Europe. The first bishop of Lisbon, after the capture of the town, was an Englishman, Gilibert; the first priests who did duty at the Church of Saint-Vincent-without-the-walls were English also. Education must have been understood by them to mean the methods according to which it was carried on in their own country. The annals of Portugal tell us that the Crusaders, sailing from the north of Europe towards Palestine, very often stopped at Lisbon. Amongst them there were priests, who sometimes established themselves in the new kingdom. It would have been difficult for them not to adopt, in teaching as in various other things, the customs of England, of Germany, and especially of France. Fernando must have learned at the church-school grammar, with rhetoric and dialectic, at least, the very elementary stages of these subjects.[1]

[1] The zeal of the clergy as regards teaching had been fanned many times by the canons of the Councils, and notably of the third and fourth Lateran Councils (1179 and 1215). But there was no idea in these schools of teaching the whole of the trivium and quadrivium. The Church only desired to impart really necessary instruction, and to prepare clerks able to work later on for the

Doubtless he was initiated into the art of music, that is, in plain chant: as the choristers' schools were not yet separated from the church-schools, there is no doubt he must have shared in the Church's ceremonies. Thus he would find himself prepared for the life of a Canon Regular, which he was going to embrace in the first flush of his youth. But we must not push these conjectures too far.

In the text of Surius we find the following details about Fernando's childhood: "Almost from the cradle he was marked out by his faultless behaviour. He was not like most children, who, even at a very early age, love the pleasures and vanities of the world. But, diligently following the example of his pious parents, he often visited churches and monasteries, he delighted to open his hand to the poor, to help them in their poverty, and to him might have been applied the words of the saintly Job when he says of himself: "For from my infancy mercy grew up with me . . ."[1] And a little further on: "Thus, following the example of the patriarch Jacob, he passed his

salvation of souls. We feel the liveliest regret that there is no special work which would tell us about the early history of teaching in Portugal.

[1] Here is the text of Surius, *op. cit.*, p. 188: "Ab ipsis prope incunabulis multa fuit morum probitate et integritate, nec, sicut tenera puerorum solet aetas, mundi lasciviam et vanitatem complexus est; sed bonorum parentum sedulus imitator, ecclesiarum et monasteriorum crebro terebat limina, manusque suas libenter extendebat ad pauperes, ut illorum inopiam sublevaret; ut posset in illum quoque competere quod de se beatissimus Job ait: 'Ab infantia mea crevit mecum miseratio . . .' Ita pueritiae aetatem instar patriarchae Jacob domi simpliciter exegit . . ."

childhood in all simplicity, under the paternal roof." Have we here only one of those oratorical outbursts which we come across too frequently in the hagiographers as we get farther and farther away from the time when the original life was written? We do not venture to decide, but the testimony of Surius alone does not seem to us weighty enough to carry conviction.

Before concluding this chapter, in which we could have wished to elucidate the whole question more completely, we must recall a Portuguese tradition, not to admit it, but to demonstrate the eagerness of the people of Lisbon to adorn the life of their glorious countryman. One day Fernando was assailed by a violent temptation in the cathedral, at the very moment of prayer; then he traced a cross on the marble steps which led up to the quire, and this cross made an impression on the step as if the latter had been composed of some material soft as wax. To this day they show this cross, having taken the trouble to gild it and protect it by railing. But, in spite of the tradition, we cannot admit this story upon which the old Bollandists themselves have cast doubt. One biographer has pointed out that in his day they used to show in the chapel of Saint-Vincent-without-the-walls not merely one cross, but four, which he is supposed to have traced in this way with his finger on the stone. Before we could accept these two statements we should need authoritative testimony, which does not exist.[1]

[1] J. Cardoso, *Agiologico Lusitano*, vol. iii. A comment dated the 13th of June. *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, p. 5 and p. 521, and *Acta Sanctorum, Junii*, vol. iii., p. 199, Paris, 1867.

CHAPTER II

AMONG THE CANONS REGULAR OF ST AUGUSTINE

AT the age of fifteen Fernando resolved to retire into a monastery. His earliest biographer gives us the following reason for the step: the youth felt himself tempted by the allures of guilty pleasures, and he distrusted his own strength. A contemporary critic has thought proper to scoff at the notion of this motive furnished by the author of the original life.[1] We shall not follow him in this. The violence of unlawful instincts may appear in the most carefully shielded youths. Besides, we must remember that Fernando lived in the Middle Ages, at a period in which men's untamed senses were manifesting themselves in strangely varied ways, in which faith needed all her might to curb the physical nature's rebellion. Those very temptations that the old chronicler attributes to Fernando were experienced by Bernard before he was sixteen years old. If, at the time of which we are speaking, so many men took refuge in the cloister that they might there ensure their souls' safety, it was because they saw

[1] Dott. Leopoldo Palatini, *Sant' Antonio di Padova, dalla leggenda allo storia*, p. 19. Reggio, 1895. See a passage from Dr Lempp, in the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xii., p. 417, note 2.

what great dangers awaited them in the world. Moreover, the proximity of the Moors in Spain, and on the Barbary coast, had a deleterious influence on the moral of the Christians who then inhabited the Spanish peninsula. To decide to what extent this point is true as regards Portugal, one need only read the history of the rulers of this country, and in particular of Sancho I. Let us not forget either that Lisbon has always been a peculiarly dangerous spot, like all the great commercial ports, and more than most perhaps, by reason of the mildness of its climate, and the innumerable beauties it possesses.

Resolved to consecrate himself to God, Fernando wished to do so in a more thorough fashion by enrolling himself as one of the Canons Regular of St Augustine. He had long since learnt to admire and value them, for they owned, in the outskirts of Lisbon, the monastery of Santo Vincente de Fóra, which we have called before Saint-Vincent-without-the-walls. This house had been founded by King Alphonso I., during that very siege of Lisbon of which we have spoken, so that they might pray there for the repose of the souls of the Crusaders who would perish in the assault.[1] It was a daughter-house of the monastery of St Cross at Coimbra, from which it had asked monks, and it practised with fervour all those virtues which distinguished the Canons Regular.

[1] We venture to refer our readers to the *Portugalliae Monumenta historica*, vol i., pp. 90-95. There they will find the *Indiculum fundationis monasterii S. Vincentii*, which tells in very vivid fashion the history of the beginnings of the monastery.

We will not stop to tell the history of this monastery, where Fernando only remained two years. Resolved to serve none but God and men's souls, he was constantly troubled by visits from his friends, who were far too fond of coming to Lisbon to see him.[1] He decided to go away from his native town, and, as his naïve biographer has it, "to change his place of abode without changing his religion." After many entreaties he obtained the permission of the Prior of St Vincent to retire to Coimbra,

[1] We think it necessary here to quote the actual text of the *Port. Monum, hist., p.* 117: "Ubi cum annis ferme duobus commoratus, frequentiam amicorum piis mentibus importunam sustinuisset, ut omnem sibi perturbationis ejuscemodi occasionem tolleret, natale solum, quod ad enervandos viriles animos non mediocriter potest, derelinquere statuit . . ." As, in this passage, the author only speaks of Fernando's friends, Azzoguidi makes use of it to uphold the view of Sicco Polentone, who tells us, when talking of Fernando's sojourn at St Vincent: "Jam diem parentes obierant . . ." But we think Azzoguidi has pressed the original text too far. If that text does not expressly mention his parents, it is probably because it is written in an oratorical manner, and the author has made no attempt to be very precise. Who tells us that Fernando's parents used to go and see him too often, against his desire, and that he found them importunate? He may very well have loved their visits, and yet have feared those of his friends. *Cf. Sicconis Polentonii de Sancti vita et miraculis commentarius*, with the notes added to the text by Fr. Ant. Maria Azzoguidi, pp. 16 and 78, note 12, at the beginning of the edition of the *Sermones in Psalmos* of St Antony, whom he calls "of Lisbon." Bologna, 1757.

A keen controversy has grown up over this matter, for the following reason: If St Antony's parents died early, he could not have exerted his miraculous powers on behalf of his father as Surius and Pacheco give evidence. (See pages 35 and 101 of this book.) Azzoguidi has few partisans. He is fiercely attacked by Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 398-415.

where the Canons Regular admitted him into their monastery of Holy Cross. He was destined to remain there until the moment came for his entry into the Franciscan fraternity.

Here, it seems, is the fitting time to speak of the religious community among whom Fernando spent ten years of his youth, from his fifteenth to his twenty-fifth year. The general word "Canon" seems to have meant, in the Western Church, clergy vowed to the service of a particular church, living according to rule.[1] Just at first they did not all have the same constitutions: but, at the second Lateran Council, Innocent II. decreed that all should follow the rule of St Augustine (1139). This rule was so-called, not because it sprang from the great doctor of Hippo, but because it was based on his two discourses, *De moribus clericorum suorum*, and on his one hundred and twenty-first Letter, addressed to some nuns.[2]

[1] For the general history of the regular Canons, it will always be found helpful to consult "*l'Histoire des Ordres monastiques religieux et militaires*" (by P. Hélyot) vol. ii. Paris, 1721. But more than anything else we recommend the learned articles by P. H. Denifle, *Die Constitutionem des Predigerordens*, in the *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, *Band* i., pp. 154-227. In considering the constitutions of the Dominicans, who are really Canons Regular of St Augustine, he has presented a remarkably truthful picture of the whole Augustinian fraternity. We have profited much by his work, and we shall always feel deep gratitude to him.

[2] For the history of this monastery we earnestly beg our readers to consult, in vol. i. of the *Portugalliae Monumenta historica*, the *Vita Tellonis archidiaconi notitiaque fundationis coenobii S. Crucis Conimbricensis*, pp. 62-78. and *Vita S. Theotonii*, pp. 79-88.

The rules of which it was made up were wide enough to allow ample latitude to the minister of souls. But it was permissible for the different Augustinian communities to fill in these general regulations, make them detailed and exact. This is what was done by the congregations of Prémontré, of St Victor de Paris, and of St Cross of Coimbra, to mention no others. This monastery had been founded in 1132 by D. Tello, archdeacon of the diocese, and had had as its first prior St Theotonio.[1] The kings of Portugal and the Sovereign Pontiffs took pleasure in befriending this new congregation. St Cross numbered, from the first years of its existence, seventy-two members; it was exempted from the bishop's jurisdiction, and it had several parishes belonging to it, in especial that of Lereina. We must not forget that the duty of the Canons Regular, no matter to which congregation they belonged, was not only to perform choir-services, but also to care for the health of the souls of those who came to the church where they happened to be, or in the parishes which were within its jurisdiction: *Clericus regularis mysteria Dei dispensat*, is formally stated in their constitutions. We must not regard them as monks; they were considered strangers to the monastic state, and looked upon themselves as leading a more elevated kind of life. It is true that the monks properly so-called disputed this view, and St Thomas Aquinas was in later times to make himself their spokesman, when he maintained that a

[1] *Cf.* Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, S. Aurelii Augustini*, vol. v., col. 1568-1581, and vol. ii., col. 958-965.

Canon Regular might enter a religious order, because he would be then entering on a more perfect way of life.[1] In any case, the question was settled as far as Holy Cross was concerned. By a decree which we still possess, Pope Adrian IV. had forbidden the Canons Regular of this monastery, after their profession was made, to quit it without the express consent of the prior and the whole community.[2] The formula according to which they made their profession was everywhere the same, or but very slightly different: they vowed themselves to the service of God and the saints to whom the church was dedicated, and they promised obedience to the prior, and all who might succeed him.[3]

Let us here add one point characteristic of all Canons Regular: they were devoted, in special fashion, to education. But education with them had a well-defined object of its own: it was to make their pupils more fit for the service of God and men's souls, and to prepare them, if they had

[1] *Cf.* Anselm von Havelberg, *Tractatus de ordine canonicorum regularium*, apud Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum* iv.,2, pp. 75 *sqq* . . . and in Migne, *Patrologiae latinae cursus completus*, vol. 188, pp. 1091-1119. *S. Thomae Aquin. Summa Theologica*, 2ª IIae, *quaest.* 189, 8 *ad* 2. Bar-le-Duc, 1867. We must not forget that the regular canons were also called *clerici religiosi*, *clerici regulares*, *clerici professi*, *clerici communiter viventes*.

[2] *Portug. Monum. hist.*, vol. i., p. 70.

[3] *Cf.* Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, vol. iii., p. 867, where the learned monk gives us the vow of the regular Canons of Marbach, and Amort, *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium*, vol. i., p. 348, in which we find that of the regular Canons of Porto.

enough natural aptness, to fulfil pastoral offices in the Church. The monastery gave elementary instruction to the children who came to its school. It bestowed it more abundantly, and of a more advanced character, on the youths whom it desired to retain, while the most zealous care was given to the Canons who happened to be more highly gifted than their Brothers in religion.[1]

St Cross of Coimbra was faithful to the spirit as well as the letter of these constitutions. As the monastery of St Ruf of Avignon enjoyed a well-established reputation for fervour, it had sent one of its members, a priest named Peter, to study the customs there and make them known to his Brothers.[2] He, on two occasions, made a fairly long stay at St Ruf, examining all those questions concerning strict observance of the Rule, or doctrinal matters, in which his own convent might possibly be at fault. It is said that the second time he brought back with him a Capitulary, the idea of chanting the anthems, St Augustine's Commentary on St John, as well as on certain questions in the Gospels according to St Matthew and St Luke, the Hexameron of St Ambrose, with his Pastoral and his book dealing with Penance, and finally, Bede's Commentary on St Luke.

[1] Amort., *op. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 350 and 391.

[2] *Portug. Monum. hist.*, vol. i., pp. 67, 68, in the *Vita Tellonis archidiaconi*: "Scrutans si aliquid deesset nobis vel in more, seu aliqua ecclesiastica doctrina. Ita que ipse omni ecclesiastico ordine perfectus, adduxit nobis Capitularium integrum, Antifonarii morem, Augustinum super Joannem, item super quasdam quaestiones Matthei et Luce, Exameron Ambrosii, item de penitentia, item Pastoralem, et Bedam super Lucam."

To give a better idea of the atmosphere in which Fernando lived as long as he remained with the Canons Regular, let us recall in a few words the image of St Theotonio, the first prior of St Cross. He must have left a mark not yet effaced by that time, since he had ruled there for twenty years with a wisdom which excited universal admiration. King Alphonso I. never set out on an expedition without recommending himself to the prior's prayers. Laymen often came to his door and asked to be allowed to see him. But this favour was seldom granted, because the holy prior feared the world's intrusion into his community. St Theotonio maintained friendly relations with St Bernard, and, at the close of his life, he used to love to lean upon a stick which had been given him by the Abbot of Clairvaux.[1] When Fernando entered the monastery of St Cross, he found there all he could want, since he had vowed his life to prayer and study. This is what the author of the first biography tells us on this point: "Because, according to the testimony of Holy Scripture,[2] it is not the fact of having gone to Jerusalem, but of having lived well when there, that merits praise, his conduct was such that it was plain to the eyes of all that he had chosen the means, in this place, of attaining to a very high state of perfection. With no ordinary zeal, he ceased not to cultivate his mind, and he was ever exercising his soul in meditation: and, when circumstances per-

[1] *Cf. Vita S. Theotonii, loc. cit.*, pp. 79-88.

[2] The anonymous writer is here in error, and Surius, *op. cit.*, p. 188, rightly corrects him and attributes the statement to St Jerome.

mitted, he ceased his sacred reading neither day nor night. Sometimes, as he read in their bare truth passages from history, he strengthened his faith by allegorical comparisons; sometimes, as he studied the words of Scripture, he warned his soul what it must seek after. At times, with fruitful curiosity closely scrutinising the profundity of the divine words, he kept his mind free from the snares of error by the witness of Scripture; at others again, he devoted himself to meditation on the words of the Saints. What he read he committed to his tenacious memory, so that he soon acquired a knowledge of the Scriptures which surprised everyone." [1]

These words are very vague, and do not yield up to us the secret of the ten years which Fernando spent with the Canons Regular. We should have liked to know in detail what were his subjects of

[1] The passage is very obscure, and as we do not feel certain of having always seized the writer's thought, we think it well here to give the Latin text: "Et quoniam, scriptura teste, non Jerosolymis fuisse, sed ibidem bene vixisse laudabile est: ita se moribus aptum exhibuit, ut cunctis liquido claresceret quod ob comprehendendam perfectionis summam loci commoditatem exquisivisset. Non mediocri autem studio semper colebat ingenium et animum meditationibus exercebat; nec diebus aut noctibus pro temporis convenientia a lectione divina cessabat. Nunc historiae veritatis textum legens, allegorica comparatione roborabat fidem; nunc conversis Scripturae verbis aedificabat moribus affectionem. Hinc profunda sermonum Dei felici curiositate perscrutans, contra erroris foveas testimoniis Scripturae intellectum munivit; hinc sanctorum dicta sedula indagatione revelavit. Ita demum lecta tenaci commendabat memoriae, ut insperata cunctis Scripturae scientia festinato mereretur affluere." *Cf. Portugal. Monum. hist., loc. cit.*, p. 116.

study, especially during his sojourn at Coimbra. No question but that he found facilities for study at the monastery of St Cross which he cannot have had at St Vincent. We must not forget that the capital of Portugal at this period was not Lisbon, but Coimbra. The princes of the royal family often visited St Cross, and left behind tokens of their liberality. This monastery accordingly had at its disposal special funds for the instruction of the Canons Regular. We know, for instance, that King Sancho I. had granted it for ever an annual income of 400 morabitins for the maintenance of those members who were to go and study in France.[1] It is to be believed, besides, that the books brought from St Ruf by the priest Peter were not the only ones possessed by the royal monastery. From that time onward, according to the historians, it became the chief centre of scientific and literary culture in Portugal, and thus paved the way for the famous University which, founded originally at Lisbon in 1290, was a little later (1308) to take up its abode close by the monastery, in the quiet, grave city of Coimbra.[2]

We may conjecture, from what we know of the studies pursued at that epoch, that Fernando acquired among the Canons Regular whatever knowledge of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic he may still

[1] The text of this endowment is given by F. A. Carlos das Neves, *op. cit.*, p. 52, according to D. Nicolau de Santa Maria, in the *Chronica da Ord. dos. Con. Regr. de Santo Agostinho.*

[2] *Cf.* Carlos das Neves, *op. cit.*, p. 53. P. Denifle, *Di Entstehung*, etc., pp. 523 *et sqq.*

have been deficient in. But it is scarcely probable that he can have been acquainted with the Pagan literatures of antiquity, of which there is hardly a trace to be found in his works.[1] His studies must have been almost altogether confined to the Holy Scriptures. But he studied them, not as we do to-day, seeking for the exact meaning of the text, but as did nearly all the mediæval commentators, drawing from that text allegorical and moral reflections. This is what, in decidedly obscure terms, the original biographer tells us. It is what we discover very markedly if we examine those works of the Saint of which the authenticity has been least disputed. However this may be, it was in Portugal, and especially at St Cross, that he must have acquired his extraordinary knowledge of sacred literature. He reveals it, almost unconsciously, on a certain occasion at Forli; he gives proof of it in his later preaching, but he could not possibly have

[1] Of course, there is no question here of the Greek Classics, which were then unknown; they had a *Homerus Latinus*, or perhaps an Æsop put into Latin verse, but none of the Greek poets. Aristotle was known, late in the day, by translations in Latin made from Arabic translations: earlier, they made use of Boëtius, who had set forth the great philosopher's doctrines in Latin. As for the Latin poets, Virgil and even Ovid were the objects of astonishing popularity in certain schools, especially at Orleans. *Cf.* L. Delisle, *les Ecoles d'Orléans au XII^e^ et au XIII^e^ siècle*, in *l'Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, vol. vii., pp. 44 and *sqq.*, 1869. *Cf.* also, as regards the grammatical subjects in general, Ch. Thurot, *de l'Organisation de l'enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au moyen âge*, Paris, 1850, and the excellent preface which Prof. D. Reichling has written at the beginning of his work *Das Doctrinale des Alexander de Villa-Dei*, Berlin, 1893.

gained it during his sojourn among the Franciscan fraternity, either in Sicily or at the hermitage of Monte Paolo.[1]

Azzoguidi, in his preface at the beginning of *Sermones in Psalmos*, points out that the Saint was not merely acquainted with the Vulgate version, but knew also paraphrases in Greek, Syriac, Arabic and Chaldaic, "with which he had made himself familiar." A biographer of our own day makes this an occasion for speaking enthusiastically of the Saint's polyglot knowledge: misinterpreting Azzoguidi's statement, he thinks that he read fluently Hebrew (*sic*), Syriac, Arabic and Chaldaic. His assertion presents no shade of probability: we must ask him at what school and from what masters the Saint could have learnt these languages. He can only have been able to read these paraphrases in a Latin version. In addition, had he even read them at full length, and is Azzoguidi's view very likely to be true, since he does not afford us a single proof of the truth of his statement?[2] The Saint could have found in glossaries the occasional

[1] *Cf. infra*, pp. 41 and 46.

[2] Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, p. 9. C. das Neves, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., c. ii., particularly p. 166. This last biographer says that nearly all those who have written the Saint's life speak highly of his knowledge of Greek, and he seems to share this opinion. He quotes in support of this view the translations of Greek words which are to be found in his writings. Whilst admitting that these translations are remarkably accurate, it must be said these isolated words prove nothing: it would have been so easy to find them out in the first glossary at hand! But we leave to M. C. das Neves the responsibility of his statement concerning the biographers before him.

words which the Italian monk has noted in the book he attributes to him. But it yet remains to be proved that the book was written by St Antony at all, and that proof has not yet been forthcoming.[1]

We must also preserve extreme caution as regards the Saint's patristic lore. We have said that the Canons Regular possessed some of the writings of the Fathers; but we cannot prove that he had read them. Did he know them except from those commentaries so frequent in the Middle Ages, in which were to be found, not a synthesis of their doctrine, but a fragmentary idea, some one word employed to comment on an isolated passage of Scripture?[2] In any case, we do not find ourselves able to state that he devoted himself to the study of any Father particularly, and we cannot make an exception even in respect to St Bernard.[3]

As for the Saint's knowledge of Natural History, which has been much praised, in our eyes it is in no way remarkable. It may easily have been borrowed from the lapidaries (lists of minerals) *bestiaries* (collections of animal fables) and other encyclopædic collections so well known to the learned men of the Middle Ages. The *Etymologies* of St Isidore of Seville would

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 186.

[2] Amongst the writers of these gloses on Scripture, we may mention Cassiodorus—who has mainly made use of St Augustine—St John of Damascus, Haymon of Halberstadt, Raban Maur, Walafrid Strabon, Anselm of Laon. Walafrid Strabon's, called *Glossa ordinaria*, was the best known.

[3] Cf. *infra*, p. 136.

in itself very nearly supply him with all his knowledge.[1] The only exception we make is as regards medical matters, and especially human physiology. But our information is far too doubtful for us to state that it was at Coimbra he acquired this knowledge.[2]

Whilst we are still with Fernando amongst the Canons Regular, let us mention two miracles which are said to have marked his sojourn at St Cross. One day when he was detained by some humble duty and prevented from being present at Mass, the walls of the monastery were opened for him at the moment of the Elevation of the Host, so that he was able to adore the Sacred Host. Another time, he is said to have had a sick Canon to look after, and to have recognised that the illness was of demoniac origin. He then threw his amuce upon the shoulder of his Brother in religion, and is said thus to have immediately cured him. Unfortunately for these two events we have only the very doubtful evidence of D. Cornejo, who wrote at the end of the seventeenth century, whose critical powers, moreover, are very inadequate.[3]

[1] *S. Isidori Hispalensis Etymologiarum libri* 20. In Migne, *Patrologiae latinae Cursus completus*, vol. lxxxii. This book of St Isidore's really constitutes a huge encyclopædia which is too little known by the mass of mediævalists.

[2] C. das Neves, *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 53, tells us of a professor belonging to St Cross, who graduated at Paris, who was called *Domnus Petrus Petri, magnus in Gramatica, Logica, Medicina, et in Theologia.* He bases this on a book in the Archive-room of this monastery, but does not give any date.

[3] D. Cornejo published in 1684 his *Chronica seraphica* (Madrid). It is in part ii., pp. 298 et *sqq.* that he gives the life of the Saint. Cf. *Act. SS., vol. cit.*, p. 199.

We have now to relate how it happened that Fernando left the Canons Regular to enter that holy fraternity which he was destined, under the name of Antony, to glorify to such a wonderful extent.

CHAPTER III

WITH THE FRANCISCANS

AFTER having been confined for some time within the limits of certain of the Italian states, the zeal of St Francis of Assisi and his disciples had at last overflowed upon all Christian Europe. To speak only of Portugal, the Franciscan Friars arrived there as early as 1217. Princess Sancia, sister of King Alphonso II., had given them the little chapel of St Catherine at Alenquer, and had built for them a house such as they wished. Not long after Queen Urraca in her turn gave them the little monastery of St Antony of Olivarès, so named from the site planted with olive trees where it was situated, a mile away from Coimbra.

Fernando must have soon known them, at least by reputation: the sons of the *Poverello* of Assisi, as poor as their father, used often to come and ask alms from the monastery of St Cross. If we may believe a lesson in the breviary belonging to the Canons Regular of Portugal,[1] he fulfilled in that monastery the office of guest-master, which would have brought him into frequent relations

[1] We do not possess this breviary, and we have not been able to study it. But we have found the statement quoted by Azevedo, Dissertation XVIII., p. 138.

with the Franciscan Brothers. It was owing to his office that he performed the duties of hospitality to five of them, who were destined to be the glory of their growing Order, and to have a most remarkable influence upon the fate of the young Canon.

These Friars were named Berardo da Corbio, Pietro da San Geminiano, Ottone, Adjuto and Accursio. They had been given as their head Vitale, but had been obliged to leave him in Aragon, where he had fallen seriously ill, and to replace him by Berardo. Doubtless they intended to proclaim Jesus Christ to the infidels: but their chief aim seems to have been to attain the martyr's palm. Whilst their founder turned his steps towards the land of the Soldan, they were determined to go and find the *Miramolin*, or Emperor, of Morocco. Following a route which seems very strange to us now, but which was then the easiest, they went from Aragon to Castille, and then on to Portugal. Being well received by Dona Sancia in her house at Alenquer, they had then gone also to Coimbra to see Queen Urraca, and Fernando had been able to entertain them and admire them.

They then went to Seville, that is to say, into Musulman territory. Their preaching angered the Emir, who at first wished to put them to death, but finally contented himself with expelling them. When they reached Morocco, they insisted on being admitted to the presence of the Miramolin, who was at this time Abu Jacub. He was not naturally disposed towards persecution: he pre-

ferred to remain, in the midst of pleasures of every kind, far within his palace, or, better still, to lead a pastoral life and drive the flocks to graze himself. The terrible defeat sustained by his father Mohammed el Nasir at Toulouse some years before (1212) must have cooled his fanaticism, and perhaps also he paid some attention to the letter which Pope Honorius III.[1] had written to him on behalf of the Christians of Morocco (1219). Besides, he had at the head of his troops a Christian Prince, to whom he wished to show consideration: we mean Don Pedro, brother of Alphonso II., King of Portugal, who had voluntarily gone into exile as the result of a family-feud. But the Franciscans thirsted for martyrdom. Berardo was preaching to the people when the Miramolin happened to pass by, on his way to visit the tombs of his ancestors outside the city. The sight of the ruler did not silence him, and Abu-Jacub, thinking that he was mad, ordered him to be conducted back to Ceuta with the other Franciscans, that they might return as soon as possible to Christian territory. The Infante Don Pedro gave them a guard to accompany them to this spot: but as soon as the escort had left them, they made all haste to return to the town of Morocco. The Miramolin then had them imprisoned for twenty days, given over to all the tortures of hunger and thirst. When they were released, they were as full of life as ever, and

[1] This letter is to be found in *Caesaris S. R. E. Cardinalis Baronii, Od. Raynaldi et Jac. Laderchii Annales ecclesiastici*, vol. xx. p. 420, Bar-le-Duc, 1870.

determined to pursue their preaching with ardour. To prevent their endangering themselves, the Infante took them with him on an expedition against the rebels, when Berardo saved the army, by causing a spring of water to gush forth just at the right moment when men and beasts were dying of thirst. But once returned, the Franciscan Brothers escaped Don Peter's vigilance; Berardo, to preach Jesus Christ, did not fear to mount the very car of Abu-Jacub himself. The latter would endure this no longer, and gave orders to one of his officers that they should be put to death. But first the most terrible torture was inflicted upon them. They were beaten so cruelly that their internal organs were soon exposed. Their wounds had boiling oil and vinegar poured upon them, and they were rolled in this condition over fragments of glass and earthenware. Then they were urged to abjure their faith, promised honours, riches, pleasures. Confronted with a decisive refusal, the Miramolin wished to execute them himself: he struck them in the middle of the forehead, then decapitated them (Jan. 16th, 1220).

The people seized their corpses and dragged them outside the town. But the Infante, with the help of some of the faithful, and also by means of money suitably distributed, was able to recover them and place them in a safe spot. He then resolved to take them back in person to a Christian country. After many difficulties he reached Seville, then in Castille; but, having reached Galicia, he dared not pursue his journey right to Coimbra. He found a refuge

for some time with Alphonso IX., king of Leon, after he had entrusted his precious burden to a knight of his train.[1]

The Court and all Portugal had heard and marvelled at the martyrdom of the five Minorite Friars, and the many miracles which had followed it. Queen Urraca, with all the people of Coimbra, walked in front of their remains, which were placed in their monastery of St Cross, to remain there for ever.[2] Historians have questioned why they were not rather taken to the sons of St Francis who lived at St Antony of Olivarès. They have imagined the reason to be that Queen Urraca, deeply devoted to the martyrs whom she had received, who had foretold to her her approaching death, wished to keep nearer herself their hallowed remains. We think they have gone too far afield in their researches, simply because they did not know what a House of Minorite Friars was like at that period. As a matter of fact, the little chapel of St Antony, if, be it understood, there ever was one, would have been much too poor to receive the two reliquaries in which the Infante had caused the relics of the martyrs to be placed.

[1] For all this story we have analysed the *Passio SS. Martyrum fratrum Beraldi, Petri, etc* . . . published as an appendix to vol. iii. of the *Analecta franciscana*, pp. 579-594. Quaracchi, 1897. Compare also the abridged account published by Karl Müller, as the 3rd appendix to his important work, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenorders und der Bussbrüderchaften*, Freiburg, i., B. i., 885 and also *Acta SS.*, vol. ii. for January, pp. 426-435.

[2] Always excepting one of the holy bodies which was given to a sister of the King's, St Teresa, abbess of the Benedictines of Lorvano ; *Cf.* Azevedo, p. 342.

In any case, the fame of the miracles worked by the Franciscan martyrs made the most profound impression upon Fernando: to pour out his blood for the love of Christ and thus attain Paradise, that was the end towards which henceforward all his thoughts, all his desires, were directed. Here are the ideas which, according to his oldest biographers, he formulated within his heart: "If but the Almighty would deign to let me share the violent death of His holy martyrs! If only the sword of the executioner might strike me at the very moment when I was on my knees bowing my head in the name of Jesus! Dare I believe I shall see such a thing? Dare I think I shall ever be permitted the day of such happiness?"[1]

But it was scarcely likely that he would attain the end he longed for so ardently while he remained a Canon Regular, attached to the monastery of St Cross. He then determined to become a Franciscan. The Brothers Minor who lived at St Antony of Olivarès used very often to come and ask alms of the Canons Regular, and Fernando liked to talk with them often in private. One day he said these words to them: "My very dear Brothers, I would gladly assume the habit of your Order if you would promise to send me directly after my entrance among you to the country of the Saracens; thus should I acquire the same merits as your holy Martyrs, and I should share their crown." These good men, simple and illiterate, accepted such a suggestion with joy. That no time might be lost, it was

[1] *Portugall. Monum. hist.*, p. 117.

arranged that the very next day they would admit him into their humble community.

There were however some difficulties to be surmounted before passing in this way from an acknowledged Order into a religious fraternity which was not yet regarded as an approved congregation, whose Rule was not yet definitely settled, which a man might leave at will. Whatever may have been thought elsewhere of the vows of the Canons Regular, we have said that Adrian IV. had cut short the dispute as regards the monastery of St Cross; the permission of the Prior and the entire community was required before this House could be left.[1] The early legend tells us that Fernando asked the consent of the Prior, and did not obtain it without difficulty: as for that of the other Canons, there is no mention of this in the story. Whether they were consulted or not, it is most probable that they would not have seen him depart without a feeling of dissatisfaction. In any case, just when he was going away, after having put on the Franciscan habit, one of them ran up to him and said with some bitterness: "Go! go! for you will become a Saint!" He turned round and was content to answer with humility: "When you hear that I have become holy, you will praise God."[2] It seems to us that here by the word "holy," the Canon who thus reproached Fernando meant a man of extraordinary saintliness, manifested in miracles. It is as if he had said: "Leave us and

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 18.

[2] *Portugall. Monum. hist.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 118.

go to the Minorite Friars: for amongst them you will become a martyr, a miracle-worker." And we may thus interpret Fernando's reply: "Let me be; for if you learn that I have attained to such glory, you will praise God for it all."

It was thus at the monastery of St Cross itself that Fernando received the habit of St Francis, and from the hands of the Minorite Friars. However strange this fact may appear in our eyes, it is witnessed by the text possessing the greatest authority. He set out with his new brothers in religion for their House at Olivarès. Then it was that he gave up his own name to take that of Antony, by which we know him henceforward. Far from being the usual custom of the Franciscans, such a change of name seems to have been an exception at this time.[1] How are we to explain this divergence from the ordinary practice of the Minorite Friars? We have two versions of the matter, neither of which satisfies us. The first declares that the Saint feared the impetuous remonstrances of his parents, and the solicitude of those who used to come and visit him.[2] We do

[1] We are speaking, be it understood, of a change of Christian name: the surname was then of minor importance, and was not retained by the Franciscans. When his Christian name did not adequately distinguish a Minorite Friar they used often to add the name of his country or some other distinguishing point.

[2] The text says expressly "*parentum suorum impetum*," which would seem to prove that his father and mother were still alive. So the question of which we have spoken above, concerning the date of their deaths, would be settled. However, we must not forget that in mediæval Latin the term *parentes* has a less restricted meaning than in classical Latin. Du Cange, in his

not see how a simple change of name could have hidden him from their inquiries. The second flatly contradicts the first, and says the friars gave the new Brother the name of Antony because that was the name of the titular Saint of the church at that place.[1] This explanation seems to us insufficient: the Minorite Friars had probably some better reason for giving the newcomer the name of their local patron-saint. The authors of the two versions, however, here agree in adding a naïve remark, founded on one of those curious lists of words so dear to the times with which we are concerned, which may be found on every page of the works, authentic or apocryphal, of our Saint. Antony, according to them, means "he who thunders with great force, *alte tonans*. And indeed, they add, his voice, like a powerful clarion, when he spoke to the religious of the divine Wisdom hidden in mystery, uttered thoughts so beautiful and so profound concerning the Scriptures, that few of his auditors could fully understand the beauty of his exposition, even those among them who had had long practice in seeking to understand texts." [2]

Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, Paris, 1845, thus begins his article on *Parens*: *Sanguine proximus*, *agnatus*, *cognatus*. We feel the matter is not settled by this early text.

[1] St Antony of Egypt is here undoubtedly meant. The Minorite Friars used, in the beginning, to attend the church of the parish in which they happened to be. Later on they had little chapels where they gathered together for prayer, very modest little buildings. As we have not found any parish bearing the name of St Antony, perhaps we must take this to mean one of these chapels of the Minorite Friars.

[2] *Portug. Monum. historica*, p. 118.

He only remained a short time with the Franciscans of Olivarès. The noviciate was up till that time unknown to the Franciscan fraternity; it was not imposed upon then until that very year, that is, in 1220, by Pope Honorius III. But we must notice that the Bull is dated the 22nd of September,[1] and had not, undoubtedly, reached Portugal when Antony left that country. The writers place his departure in summer-time, or at latest at the beginning of autumn.

The ardent apostle was doubtless accompanied by another Brother, although the primitive legend does not say so. But the Minorite Friars, conforming to the example of Jesus Christ, who had sent out His disciples on their mission two and two together, never journeyed alone, especially when they were travelling to distant countries. It would be surprising if Antony had departed from the custom of the Order. If we may believe Wadding, whose evidence, however, is so much open to dispute, the question may be settled without any further doubt. The Franciscan annalist tells us that Antony set out for Morocco with Brother Philip, who was his companion till the Chapter General at Assisi during the Whitsuntide of 1221.[2] He adds the following details. When Brother Gratian brought Antony with him to Emilia, he sent Brother Philip, who

[1] *Cf.* A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* nº 6361, p. 555. Berlin, 1874.

[2] *Annales Minorum . . ., a R. P. Luca Waddingo Hiberno, editio secunda, opere et studio R. P. J. M. Fonseca ab Ebora*, vol. ii., p. 6. Rome, 1732. *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 25 and 27. For the very complicated question here treated, we may refer to the *Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis*, vol. iii., pp. 407-410. Besides

was in his eighteenth year, to Città di Castello, where the humble Brother lived until the famous Chapter after the death of St Francis (1227). Before that, he had had the happiness of knowing the seraphic Patriarch, and even of touching his stigmata. After that Chapter, he withdrew to Colombajo, near Monte Ilcino, and there he was venerated by the people on account of his love of prayer and his many miracles. He was originally called Filippo, but from humility he took the name of Filippino, and the chroniclers sometimes give him the one name, sometimes the other. His burial was marked by miracles, and also by armed affrays between the citizens of Colombajo, who wished to keep his mortal remains, and those of Monte Ilcino, who desired to take them away. The latter were victorious, and buried Brother Philip in the Church of St Francis.

It seems to us beyond doubt that a holy Brother named Philip did live at Monte Ilcino or at the neighbouring Colombajo, that he enjoyed the reputation of a miracle-worker, and that he there preached penitence to the people. On this point we have the precise evidence of Bartholomew of Pisa, who finished his *Liber Conformitatum* in 1385.[1] But he tells us

Wadding, we there have quoted other writers, such as Francesco Gonzaga and Ridolfi da Tossignano, who are later than Mariano, since they wrote at the end of the sixteenth century.

[1] *Liber Aureus, inscriptus Liber Conformitatum* . . . f° 153, v°. Bologna, 1590. But here is the short statement he makes: "Custodia Clusina habet: Locum Montis Ilcini, ubi sanctus Frater Philippinus miraculis coruscando, conversionem gentium ad Christum praedicat continuo."

nothing else, and he makes not the smallest allusion to the relations which are said to have existed between St Antony and Brother Philip. The witnesses on whom Wadding relies in making his assertion are too late to carry conviction. The most authoritative is perhaps Mariano of Florence, who, however, belongs to so late a time as the beginning of the sixteenth century, since he died in 1523 or 1527. For the rest, without absolutely contradicting the early legend's version of the meeting between St Antony and Brother Gratian, Wadding's statement does not fit in very well with this story. We shall see soon that the original biographer represents our Saint as being left alone with Brother Gratian, and begging him to be good enough to take him with him. If he had had with him Brother Philip, he would unquestionably have attracted attention, and would not have remained the least of all the Minorite Friars, ignored and neglected by the Provincials.[1]

We must not try to settle this question, for we have not sufficient data. It is not impossible that Wadding is right here. But perhaps there is also the attempt to connect with our Saint a person already venerable in himself: we shall have to formulate the same suspicion when we come to speak of the blessed Helena Enselmini.[2]

When he reached the town of Morocco, Antony could not there gather the martyr's palm. Abu Jacub, as we have said, disliked shedding blood. If we may here believe the writer who gives us

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 44. [2] *Cf. infra*, p. 157.

the narrative of the passion of the five Franciscans spoken of before,[1] the Miramolin, after killing those martyrs, had been seized with hemiplegia, which must have inclined him more than ever towards quiet and rest. Besides that, a persistent drought prevailed in the land, which injured the health of men as well as the fruits of the earth. Our Saint fell ill, and did not leave his bed of suffering throughout the winter. When he was better again he decided not to remain any longer among the infidels, and set sail to return to Portugal.[2]

Providence did not wish him to be in his own land: she had decided to send him into other countries, to preach peace and repentance, and perchance also to temper his native energy by contact with the gentle Patriarch of Assisi. He possessed henceforth the courage to climb the steep road to perfection, and a great zeal for the salvation of souls: he was now to learn to admire in Francis the beauty of charity in its grandest and most exquisite manifestations.

The vessel on which our Saint had embarked was caught by a violent storm, which caused him to turn aside from his goal, and took him to the shore of Sicily. The earliest life tells us scarcely anything of his stay in this island. According to Pacheco, he was landed at Taormina, and even stayed there. He is said to have planted cypresses

[1] *Cf. Passio S.S. Martyrum Beraldi* . . . in the *Analecta franciscana*, *loc. cit.*, and in *Portugall. Monumenta historica*, pp. 104-113.

[2] *Portug. Mon. hist.*, p. 118.

and citrons there, which were still pointed out in that writer's lifetime, and were supposed to cure certain diseases.[1] But Pacheco's evidence is very doubtful, and this tradition becomes more and more suspect when we compare it with several others which Sicily has preserved about our Saint. Thus, according to local tradition, he founded four Houses of Minorite Friars during his stay there before he went to Assisi. This assertion seems to us improbable, if we remember that this stay probably did not even last two whole months, that Antony was new to the Franciscan fraternity, that, as well, he had just recovered from a long and serious illness. It is useless to recall in detail these various legends which are easily destroyed by attentive examination: such, for instance, as the story which, among the Minorite Friars at Messina, attributes to Antony a well dug with his own hands, and a citron-tree, which he is supposed to have planted.[2] But the Franciscans, at the time when he stayed with them, had their House, not in the town itself, but on the outskirts, about three miles

[1] Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, note xxi., pp. lxxxii.-lxxxiii. The fact appears so unlikely that Mariano has thought it necessary to refer the foundation of these four monasteries to a second stay which Antony is said to have made in Sicily, from 1225 to 1227. But this fresh hypothesis is a mere fable, contradicted by the more probable facts of Antonine chronology known to us. We only know Mariano's version from Wadding, *op. cit.*, p. 128, not having at our disposal the Florentine Chronicler's work.

[2] *Acta Sanctorum Junii*, *vol.* iii., *Appendix*, p. 8. *Cf.* Azzoguidi, *loc. sup. citat.*

off.[1] However that may be, we know from the original biography that it was from the Brothers at Messina that Antony heard of the summoning of a Chapter General at Assisi, which was to be held at Whitsuntide (May 30th, 1221). All the sons of the great Franciscan Order were summoned. He determined to go there, and he arrived at the desired time to take part in it. But we have no information as to the way in which he reached Assisi. Perhaps, in spite of his weak state of health, he crossed the Italic peninsula on foot, from Calabria to Umbria.

Though not as famous as the Chapter of Mats (1219), where there were as many as 5000 friars, the Chapter of 1221 is yet celebrated in the annals of the Seraphic Family, because it was the last to which all the Brothers were admitted.[2] Antony could see 3000 of them, professed Brothers or novices, gathered in the wood close to St Mary of the Portiuncula, and overflowing with that spiritual joy which amazed the people. He could notice how eagerly the latter brought to the Minorites all that they needed in the way of food. On the seventh day it was an-

[1] *Acta S.S., loc. cit.*—Wadding, *op. cit.*, p. 54, says that this Messina convent beyond the walls was not even founded till 1222. But doubtless it had been preceded by a more modest building, since the first life says expressly : "*Quod ut viro Dei per Fratres Messanae civitatis innotuit.*" *Cf. Portugall. Monum. hist.*, p. 118.

[2] For the Chapter of 1221, it is well to read the account, full of life and interest, which is given us in the *Chronica fratris Jordani a Jano*, Nos. 16 *et sqq.*, in the *Analecta franciscana*, vol. i., p. 6 *et sqq.* Quaracchi, 1885.

nounced to the people that no other offerings would be accepted, and natheless the friars had to remain two days longer in order not to waste the provisions which had been given them. What attracted Antony's keenest attention was without doubt the sight of the Seraphic Patriarch, who had now given up the government of his religious fraternity, and, after the death of Peter of Catani, had had Brother Elias appointed Vicar-general of the Order. Elias presided: Francis, seated at his feet, at least at the final meeting of the Chapter, and unable to make himself heard, pulled his habit to suggest to him the measures he considered opportune. It was at this meeting that he proposed sending a fresh mission to Germany, where the Minorites had before been very badly received. Elias appealed to men willing to go, and immediately ninety offered themselves: Cæsar of Spires, who was to direct the undertaking, had to choose between them. In the midst of all the Brethren, Antony remained apart and kept silence. We are not told that he offered himself for this mission, and yet, to go to Germany meant exposing himself to all kinds of danger, perhaps even death. But our Saint knew no German, and was still weary with his long journey, undertaken at the close of a long and serious illness. Doubtless from that time he renounced the thought of martyrdom.[1]

The Chapter was over and the Provincials had sent the Brothers who were given into their charge

[1] Paul Sabatier, *Vie de saint François d'Assise*, p. 304. (Paris, 1894), and M. l'abbé Léon Le Monnier, *Histoire de saint François d'Assise*, vol. ii., pp. 55-60 (Paris, 1890).

each to his respective house. But no one had asked for Antony, who was therefore at the disposal of the Vicar-general. Nothing in his external appearance was likely to attract attention. He did not speak of his former studies, nor of the ecclesiastical offices which he had perhaps filled; but, submitting his intelligence and his knowledge in obedience to Christ, he professed that he wished neither to know, desire, nor obtain anything but Jesus, and Jesus crucified.[1] At last he took Brother Gratian aside, who was Provincial of Romagna, and begged him to take him away with him, if the Vicar-general consented, and instruct him in the principles of spiritual wisdom. Brother Gratian, admiring his great piety, consented to take him. When they reached Romagna Antony asked the Provincial's permission to withdraw far from men, to the hermitage of Monte Paolo, near Forli.[2]

This proceeding of St Antony's need not surprise us: on the contrary, it is in complete accord with the original spirit of the Franciscan fraternity. The aim of St Francis of Assisi, in the beginning at any rate, was to influence worldly people much less by preaching than by offering them the example of a life entirely holy, completely detached from all

[1] *Monum. Port. hist., loc. cit.* We reproduce here, as in many other places, the actual words of the first life, which are often oratorical.

[2] Three places dispute for the honour of having at that time sheltered St Antony. But the claims of Monte Paolo, on the borders of Umbria and Tuscany, near Arezzo, and of St Paolo, on a hill near Bologna, cannot be maintained. *Cf.* Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, pp. 149 *et sqq.* and Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 361, 362.

earthly things. That is why he resolved to shut himself up with his companions in hermitages, to live there in prayer, humility and renunciation. His views on this matter were so well known that Cardinal John Colonna of St Paul, one of his first protectors, advised him in the beginning to adopt an eremitical rule for himself and his disciples. It is true Francis rejected this advice emphatically, both on this occasion and various others. But, if he determined to send his friars to preach in the world, he wished that their ministry there should always be preceded by a life of retreat in a hermitage. Later on, the necessities of the apostleship forced him to modify further his plans. But the eremitic life always had great attractions for him; in each place where he lived we find establishments designed to foster it, and he took care to establish a special Rule for the Brothers who desired to live in this way for some time.[1]

When, therefore, he withdrew to a hermitage before beginning his apostleship in the world, Antony was faithfully following in the footsteps of St Francis. The hermitage was situated on the highest summit of the mountain whose name it bore. A Brother had arranged a grotto to serve

[1] We here give the gist of the passage in which Father Ehrle, in his fine work on the origin of the Friars and their Franciscan filiation, describes so learnedly and so wisely the first idea in the mind of St Francis, and the evolution it underwent owing to the force of circumstances. In the *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirch. Geschichte*, vol. iii., pp. 552-623. Berlin, 1887.—*Cf.* also K. Müller, *Die Anfänge*, pp. 44 *et sqq.*, and P. Sabatier, *Speculum Perfectionis*, pp. 25-27. Paris, 1898.

him as a cell, so that he might there give himself up to prayer in great tranquillity. By dint of urging, Antony succeeded in persuading him to yield up to him this retreat. Henceforth, after the morning discourse, he was in the habit of retiring there, taking no other provisions than a small piece of bread and a vessel of water. So he passed the day, forcing the flesh to serve the spirit. But, faithful to the commands of his Rule, he always returned at the hour of the collation. Very often when, at sound of the bell, he wished to return to his Brethren, his poor body, overcome by night-watching and enfeebled by abstinence, faltered and refused to carry him. He would never have reached the common dwelling had not some charitable Brother supported him.[1]

We do not know how long a stay Antony thus made at Monte Paolo. There he gave little time to study,[2] but much to prayer and contemplation: the Brothers who were with him must have admired in him, not the man devoted to knowledge, but the Friar renouncing all earthly things and mortifying the flesh. The time came at last when God took this light hidden under a bushel, and placed it in a candlestick, for the very great edification of all men.

It happened that some Minorite Friars of Monte

[1] *Port. Mon. hist.*, p. 117.

[2] The hermitage must have possessed few or no books, save those necessary for the choir services. Besides, the text of the first life, as we mention on page 52, says that the Brothers of Monte Paolo knew nothing of St Antony's learning: they would have entertained a different opinion if they had seen him deep in study.

Paolo were sent to Forli to be ordained there. The same motive had brought other sons of St Francis from different localities, at the same time as some Preaching Friars.[1] Antony was also among the Friars there assembled. At collation-time, the local Superior[2] begged the Preaching Brothers who were present to be good enough to satisfy the pious eagerness[3] of those present by addressing an exhortation to them. As each excused himself, the Superior turned to Antony and bade him preach to the

[1] This is the text of the early legend, in the *Port. Monum. hist.*, p. 118: "Post multum vero temporis, contigit fratres ad civitatem Forlivii pro suscipiendis ordinibus transmitti. Convenientibus ex diversis partibus ob dictam causam fratribus, ac Praedicatoribus, affuit inter eos Antonius. . . ."

[2] The sense of the words *Minister loci* and *collatio* has been much discussed. *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 364-366, Dissert. XXI. Without desiring to go into the question in detail, we may say that probably the Head of the Minorite Friars at Forli, and the meal, rather than the collation of the Orders, is here meant.

[3] This is the text: "Ut . . . salutis verbum sitientibus proponeret." Angelico da Vicenza, with really astonishing invention, has used the word "sitientibus" to fix the date of the ordination at Forli. The Saturday which comes before the fourth Sunday in Lent is called the Saturday of *Sitientes*, because it is the beginning of the introit. But this writer has thought he had discovered in the term "sitientibus" an allusion and a date. He decides that the sermon was given on March 19th, 1222, during the first Lent after the Saint's coming to Monte Paolo. Some writers have admitted this date without discussion, not knowing on what a slender foundation it rests. In just this way a host of erroneous details have been introduced into Antony's life. To tell the truth, we know nothing as to the date of this ordination, and we cannot take literally the text of the early legend: "Post multum vero temporis . . . ." We find Angelico's statement in Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, p. 175, n. 33.

assembly as the Holy Spirit should inspire him. For he did not think this Brother knew any portion of the Scriptures in any part of them save what was used in the church office. He based his assumption on the fact of having heard him speak Latin when circumstances required it.[1] Indeed, although Antony was so finely gifted that his memory served him in place of books, and although he was most fitted to speak wonderfully of mystic things, the Brothers had thought him more suited for washing the plates and dishes than for expounding the mysteries of Scripture. He resisted at first as strongly as he could; but, overcome by the protestations of those present, he began to speak quite simply. But there was general astonishment and afterwards profound admiration when they heard him set forth his teeming ideas in an exposition at once clear, terse, learned. With all eyes fixed on the orator, his listeners appreciated to the full so much learning united to so much humility, and such wonderful eloquence lit up by the flame of love.

We have just described the ordination of Forli according to the earliest legend. Taking the text in the most natural sense, we should imagine that Antony came to Forli to be ordained. That, in reality, is just what some writers have concluded. Taking it for granted that Antony was a deacon when

[1] In the Latin text: "literaliter loqui. . . ." This expression, in the Latin classical writers, meant "to speak elegantly." But Du Cange, in his *Glossarium* which we have already quoted as an authority, tells us that in the Middle Ages it meant "to speak Latin." It is certainly the most natural meaning to attribute to it here.

he came to Monte Paolo, they have declared that he was not ordained a priest till Forli.[1] Let us stop a few moments to examine this question.

The earliest life, as edited by Father Josa, give us a different version from that of the *Portugalliae Monumenta historica*.[2] If this later version were authentic, we could not doubt that St Antony was a priest at the time when he entered the Seraphic Family. Let us see first the changes made in Father Josa's text.

"The holy Father, being new to the Order, was of so great a naïveté and simplicity, that he did not

[1] We do not concern ourselves with the evidence of such writers as Mark of Lisbon, Pietro Ridolfo, Miguele Pacheco, who combat this view, or with the testimony of Leander Albertus and Wadding, who uphold it. *Cf.* Azzoguidi, p. 149, n. 30. These writers are too much open to suspicion, and we have too often found them wrong before. It is of course a different matter in regard to Dr. Ed. Lempp, whose learning and critical powers are warmly praised in the course of our work. In the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xii., p. 424, n. 4., he says that Antony was not ordained a priest till Forli. The learned doctor's reasons do not convince us. The weightiest is based on a Bull of Pope Honorius III., dated December 3rd, 1224, on which Dr. E. Lempp relies for his statement that at this time the Minorite Friars had no chapels of their own; in that case, the Brothers of Monte Paolo would not have been in a position to regret the absence of a priest who could say Mass for them. Besides, if they had no chapels of their own, the privilege which allowed them to say Mass, even in time of an Interdict, was entirely illusory. It is more natural to interpret the Pope's words: *Si quas habere vos contigerit* (sc. ecclesias), as "in all the chapels that you may possess."

[2] *Legenda, seu Vita et miracula sancti Antonii de Padua saeculo XIII^e concinnata. . . et nunc primum edita* a P.M. Antonio Maria Josa, Min. Conv. Bologna, 1883.

yet know any Minister, he did not even know what were the duties of a Minister, a Custodian, or a Guardian. That is why he did not speak to Brother Gratian, and did not ask him to take him with him; but while the others withdrew, this man, simple and ignored by all, devoted the whole day to prayer, confiding to the Saviour's care his person, his conduct, his delay. When Brother Gratian asked him if he were a priest, he avoided many words, and did not wish to boast of his knowledge of Scripture. He answered humbly in these simple words: 'Yes, I am.' When he heard that, because of their urgent need of priests then, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Brother Gratian at once asked Brother Elias, the Minister-general, for Antony, and was given him.[1] He then made no mention of his literary culture, and did not boast of having exercised any ecclesiastical functions. . . .

"The man of God, being new to the Order, did not know what an eremitical place was, nor what was the life of the Brothers in the hermitages: that is why he did not ask permission to retire there, although he sought out spots where quiet was obtainable. But some six Brothers, who were living in a hermitage, who had no priest among them, considering that he was a simple and pious man, asked the Minister to let him come and celebrate the divine mysteries for them, and obtained him by dint of entreaties. . . ."

Then, concerning the grotto whither St Antony

[1] This is a mistake: in the life-time of St Francis, Brother Elias was only Vicar-general. But the chroniclers often confuse the two titles when speaking of this personage.

withdrew to find more complete solitude, the author of this version thus corrects the primitive text: "Although he went every day to this little cell to pray and satisfy his need of devotion, and although he stayed there, he never took with him even a vessel of water; but, at the hour of the meal, at the sound of the bell, he went down and sat at table with the others. When he had lived some time in their company, he knew the Guardian and the other Brothers a little. Seeing that all of them, not content with devoting themselves to prayer, applied themselves in the intervals to services and useful works, he reflected bitterly within himself. He looked upon himself as a useless man, unworthy of the bread which he ate, since he received services from others and did nothing himself for the common good, and so, he thought, they would think that he had come, not to serve, but to be served. This is why the humble servant of Christ, desiring lowly duties, went and begged the Guardian, and prayed him on his knees as an especial favour, to give him the duty of washing the dishes and of cleaning or sweeping the house. When he obtained this work, he performed it with astonishing care and attentive solicitude, and, working in this way, he had more heart again to eat his bread. . . ."[1]

[1] P. Josa, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10. This same Friar, at the end of this legend, has published another which he entitles *Alia Sancti Antonii vita, ab altero Franciscano anonymo saeculo xiii. exeunte concinnata,* pp. 75-123. It is later than the first, and is evidently suggested by it. However, we have discovered in it various inaccuracies. It also states that St Antony was a priest when he met Brother Gratian. It explains the Saint's presence at Forli

Summarising the contents of this second version, not only does it declare that the Saint was a priest before the Chapter General at Assisi, but besides it gives the details of his stay at Monte Paolo in such a way as to make them fit in with this assertion. Thus, Antony does not beg Brother Gratian to take him: it is the latter who comes to him and asks him if he is a priest. Also, it is not the Saint who expresses a desire to withdraw to Monte Paolo: it is the Brothers of this place who secure him to say Mass for them. There, they do not give him work: it is he who asks to be allowed to wash plates and dishes and clean the poor house. Nor must we forget this point: the second version shows an obvious intention on its author's part to contradict the first.[1] Which is it that we ought to believe on contested points?

Father Josa's text seems to represent the Antonine tradition as it existed in Padua at the end of the thirteenth century or at the beginning of the fourteenth. It is thus considerably more modern than that of the *Monumenta*. The question is, how to know if the differences it gives us are justifiable,

by saying that a provincial Chapter was to be held after the ordination. Thus Antony would have been on his way to the Chapter, and, as if by mere chance, present at the ordination. Unfortunately, we cannot rely on this text, whose author seems to care more for eloquence than the exactness of his facts.

[1] Father Hilary of Paris points out this intention in his publication, *Saint Antoine de Padoue, sa légende primitive.* Paris, 1890. But we think he goes too far when he characterises these alterations as "falsifications." (Preface, passim): his polemic is too passionate and not sufficiently careful. We must add that his criticism leaves much to be desired.

and if they rest on documents which to-day are lost or unknown, but which were known to the author of the alterations. This is the point which, in default of sufficient information, we have been unable to decide.

There are, moreover, in Father Josa's version details which amaze us. It is there said, for instance, that the Saint did not know what were the offices of Minister, Custodian and Guardian; and further on, that he did not know what the eremitic life meant. Such ignorance surprises us on the part of a man who had seen the life of the Minorite Friars in Portugal, in Sicily, and perhaps, on his way to Assisi, in some parts of Romagna. Waiting for light to be shed on the question, we think it is wiser to give the preference to the first version, as being the oldest of all.

But here we come back to the question which we have asked above: at what period was Antony ordained a priest? For, strictly speaking,[1] the text of the *Monumenta* tells us that he was among those to be ordained, but does not directly state that he himself was going to be ordained.

If the *Chronique des XXIV Généraux* were of indisputable authority, the matter would be easily decided. A Minorite Friar is there mentioned, whose death was marked by the appearance of an

[1] The *Vita auctore anonymo*, published by the Bollandists, (*Acta S.S.*, vol. iii., of June, p. 200), and the Life by J. Rigaud, p. 40, express their view in a way similar in the early legend in the *Monumenta*: the most natural meaning is everywhere that Antony was going to be ordained; but, in strictness, there is no actual mention of his being really a candidate for ordination.

extraordinary light; then the author adds: "At the same hour, St Antony of Lisbon, at the time Canon of the monastery of St Cross at Coimbra, and then called Fernando Martins, saw, as he celebrated Mass, the soul of this Brother, in the form of a bird, traverse purgatory with rapid flight, and mount in glory to heaven." Unfortunately this compilation includes documents of different origin and very unequal value, so that we cannot trust its evidence.[1]

There is another which is of just as little value in deciding the question. It seems that the prayers for the Saint, in the office of the Portuguese Canons Regular, contain the following mention: *Ad Franciscanum ordinem jam bene doctus et sacerdos factus transivit.*[2] But this prayer only dates back to the eighteenth century, and was drawn up in accordance with the generally-received tradition, at a period when criticism had not yet discussed the sources of Antonine biography.

If we were to judge the matter on the ground of probability, we should say that St Antony must have been ordained a priest before he entered the

[1] This chronicle has been published in the *Analecta franciscana.* vol. iii. Quaracchi, 1897. It has two titles in this publication. It is first called *Chronica XXIV. Generalium ordinis Minorum*, and afterwards *Chronica Generalium Ministrorum ordinis Fratrum Minorum.* The passage we quote is to be found on page 11. It is also found in a narrative of the passion of the Martyrs of Morocco, given in the appendix, p. 580. Unfortunately, this document's evidence is not above suspicion on any matter.

[2] *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, p. 338, Dissert. I.

Seraphic Family. It would be strange if, being a Canon Regular, that is to say, destined by his vocation to the ecclesiastical ministry, and having spent ten years in his congregation, he had not been introduced to the priesthood during this long sojourn. But probability is not fact, and we must abstain from giving any definite answer to this question.

We cannot say how long Antony remained at Monte Paolo. But it cannot be doubted that a short time after the incident at Forli he was summoned by the Provincial to go and preach in Romagna. The latter had heard the young friar's qualities spoken of, and evangelical workers were too few for him not to think at once of making use of Antony. Having kindled the heavenly flame in solitude and meditation, he was now to spread it abroad throughout the different Catholic countries, for the honour of the Church and the salvation of souls.

CHAPTER IV

ANTONY'S ENTRANCE INTO PUBLIC LIFE

WE now reach perhaps the most difficult part of our subject. If we could be content to rely on the evidence of Wadding or his imitators, the difficulties would become far fewer, or would even disappear altogether. But the demands of criticism are much stricter to-day than they were formerly, and it would be a great reproach to us if we treated carelessly the life of a Saint for whom we profess a particular devotion. If the sources from which we draw are confused, we must try to elucidate them; if we cannot succeed, it is our duty to caution our readers in all loyalty.

The main difficulty is to fix dates. The primitive legend only devotes two chapters, drawn up, moreover, in a vague and inexact fashion, to the period which stretches between the ordination at Forli and Antony's arrival in Padua in the autumn of 1229. It is very poor in details, and does not say one word of the Saint's stay in France. Jean Rigaud, who is more explicit, does not give us any date. On the other hand, a text of Pierre Coral's states that the Saint was at Limoges in 1226 at the latest. Let us be content with these inadequate gifts, and try to

give the facts by following the most probable chronological order.[1]

The most trustworthy writers usually agree that Antony preached first in Romagna, and that his preaching there lasted from 1222 to 1224.[2] The district was infested by the propaganda of the Cathari and the Paterini. We have no exact details as regards either the doctrines they professed in Northern Italy, their mode of action or their controversies with the Catholics. We can only opine, from what the chronicles tell us on the matter, that unquestionably they were making converts by affecting great austerity of life. We also know that Rimini was a kind of moral fortress for them, a centre of formidable action. It is true that penalties had been pronounced against them by the Emperors of Germany. But the Ghibelline faction, in its struggle with the ecclesiastical authority, found it to their interest to keep on good terms with the heretics, and this faction held power till 1226. The preachers' efforts were nearly always fruitless: they knew no arguments capable of convincing these unfortunate strayed sheep. St Antony had more success, and it seems that he was skilful enough to reduce his adversaries to silence. Besides, his piety and his doctrinal knowledge made

[1] *Cf.*, however, pp. 79, 80 of our work, with the notes. If Antony reached Limoges as early as 1223, we must admit that he must have left Romagna before 1224.

[2] The province of Romagna, in St Antony's time, included all Lombardy: in 1239 it was divided up into four provinces, one of which, that one which included Padua, received the name of St Antony. *Cf.* Sicco Polentone, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

an impression on a certain number of them: if it is unfortunately only too clear that this heresy remained still active after his departure, at least he converted a fair number of these misguided souls. Among them we must include Bononillo, who had lived thirty years in error, but after having done penance, he remained henceforward a submissive son of the Church.[1]

This is perhaps the moment to refer to two miracles which have been connected with St Antony's campaign against heresy, the scene of which has been laid by some writers in the town of Rimini. But before narrating them we must make mention of the view according to which St Antony never performed a single miracle in his whole life. Dr Lempp, who champions this view, is not content with rejecting wholesale all the evidence which tells us of the miracles attributed to the Saint in his own lifetime: he calls the Saint himself as a witness. In one of his sermons, the authenticity of which appears highly probable, if not absolutely certain, the Saint speaks of the preaching of the Apostles, and in this connection quotes the passage in which Jesus Christ promises to believers the power to

[1] The exact form of the name is not known: perhaps it was Bonvillo or something very like it. According to a legend which we do not altogether trust, because we only know of it from Salvagnini (*op. cit.*, p. 91), one of Bonvillo's servants was also converted: he is said to have embraced the true faith, led an edifying life, helped St Antony in teaching the people; then, having become both a priest and a canon, he was buried in the Church of the Minorite Friars at Rimini, June 1292. He was called John, the son of Bartolo.

work miracles. Then he adds: "At that time miracles took place for the conversion of the Gentiles; but now, because our Faith has waxed strong, miracles have ceased. For we ourselves, when we plant young trees, water them until they can draw their own nourishment from the ground."[1] Dr Lempp draws this conclusion: "Antony (in his discussions with heretics) did not have recourse to proof by miracle; but, just as did Innocent IV. at a later time, he admitted they had ceased and explained the fact."[2] It is enough just to turn over the annals of the Church both before and after St Antony's time, to see that he would have been in opposition to the universal feeling of Catholics if he had professed any such opinion. And, to mention only one point, does he thus cast doubt on, or had he forgotten, the miracles which marked the arrival in Portugal of the five martyrs of Morocco? This particular passage only reproduces in an abridged and incomplete form,—and possibly this inadequate reproduction is due to some transcriber,—a reply which we often find in the Fathers of the Church, especially in St Gregory. Jesus Christ promised to those who have faith, to all such, almost unlimited power to work miracles: they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they

[1] *Cf.* the sermons given by Father Josa at the end of his two legends, p. 130.

[2] In the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xii., p. 432.

shall recover.[1] Why, someone in the thirteenth century may well have asked, has this extraordinary power disappeared? It was to this possible objection that our Saint was replying, without ever admitting that miracles had ceased in his own time.[2]

Let us therefore dismiss Dr Lempp's opinion, which rests on conclusions carried too far. Let us consult the historical evidence: when it seems sufficiently weighty, we may admit the miracles it gives us.

The first at which we will pause, because it is

[1] St Mark xvi. 18. *Cf. Patrologiæ latinæ Cursus completus*, vol. lxxvi., *Sancti Gregorii Magni Moralium, lib.* xxvii., No. 869, and *Homiliarum in Evangelia, lib.* ii., No. 1571, Paris, Migne, 1849.

[2] Dr Lempp in the Review often quoted by us, vol. xi., p. 193, reproduces two texts which seem at first glance to confirm his view, but which in reality prove nothing. The first is taken from Father Josa's second life, p. 95: "Licet enim sanctus iste nondum miraculis corporalibus ubique coruscaret, potioribus tamen indiciis clarificabat Domini majestatem." The anonymous author is speaking of the Saint's preaching at Padua, and is pointing out of the fruits of salvation which it brought forth: conversions, return of backsliders and the rest, all which seems more valuable, in his opinion, than miracles. He is thinking of the miracles which occurred immediately after Antony's death, which made his name famous everywhere. He may not have known of those which had been performed outside Padua. He blindly sums up Father Josa's first life, where the temptation of the devil is alone spoken of. Notice the expression: *ubique coruscaret.*

The other text comes from the *Vita auctore anonymo* of the Bollandists, and proves stlll less. This says: "Multiplex post mortem miraculorum claritas necessaria conclusione confirmat (vocationem)," *loc. cit.*, p. 200. Whoever may have been the writer of this life, he may very well have known nothing of the miracles worked outside Padua, or may have been thinking only of those which followed the death, and were so important because of their number and the many witnesses of them.

connected with Bononillo's name, is that concerning the horse or mule which adored the Holy Sacrament. This is how it is described by Jean Rigaud, whose authority seems to us greater than that of the other witnesses. A heretic was resisting St Antony's exhortations, and refusing to admit the Real Presence, because he saw no change take place in the elements of the Eucharist. The pious Franciscan, pitying his unbelief and wishing to win his soul, said to him one day: "If the horse you often ride were to adore the true Body of Christ under the element of bread, would you believe in the truth of the Lord's Sacrament?" The heretic promised he would confess it both with the words of his mouth and from the depths of his heart, if it occurred under conditions which he fixed himself. The Saint agreed, adding however that if these conditions were not fulfilled, that is, if the miracle did not occur, the fault must only be imputed to his own sins. For two days the heretic deprived his horse of all food, and on the third brought him out. They brought the animal hay whilst on the other side stood St Antony, devoutly bearing the Body of Christ in a chalice. A large crowd had assembled, anxious to see what would happen. Left alone, the horse, as if it had been endowed with reason, quietly advanced and respectfully bent its knees in front of the Saint who was holding the Host. It remained in this position till Antony gave it permission to go away. This miracle decided the heretic to relinquish his error.

Such is the story as it is narrated by Jean

Rigaud.[1] He does not say that the heretic was Bononillo, or that the town where it occurred was Rimini. Bartholomew of Pisa it is who gives us these two details, in an account where he strangely distorts the miracle.[2] Wadding places it at Bourges; but we must make Toulouse the scene of it, if we are to believe Surius and the *Liber Miraculorum*. In favour of Rimini is the fact that as early as 1417 there was built on the spot where the miracle is supposed to have taken place an octagonal chapel, and this chapel had been preceded by a column erected to keep it in the remembrance of the people.[3]

In any case, if we can affirm nothing concerning the particular town and heretic who were witnesses of it, the fact is incontestably true. It is attested by much evidence, and Jean Rigaud's coming to confirm it removes all doubt.

Here is another not less famous miracle, which Jean Rigaud places in the neighbourhood of Padua, but which other writers, the author of the *Liber Miraculorum*, that of the *Fioretti*, and Sicco Polentone, think took place at Rimini. Although their evidence is worth much less than Rigaud's, it is corroborated by the erection in 1559 of a

[1] *La Vie de saint Antoine de Padoue*, by Jean Rigaud, Franciscan Friar, Bishop of Tréguier, published by Father Ferdinand-Marie d'Araules, pp. 90-92, Bordeaux, 1899.

[2] *Liber Aureus, inscriptus Liber Conformitatum Vitae B. ac Seraphici Patris Francisci ad vitam Jesu Christi Domini nostri*, p. 76, r°. Bononiae, 1590.—Wadding, *op. cit.*, p. 115.—Surius, p. 192.—*Lib. Mir.*, p. 123.

[3] L. Tonini, *Rimini nel secolo* xiii. cit. par Salvagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

monument on the borders of Marecchia, intended to commemorate the miracle. Whichever may have been the spot where it occurred, let us give the story here in its admirable *naïveté*. The heretics refused to listen to St Antony, and even turned his words to mockery. He went to the river which flowed close by, and before all the people he said to the heretics: "Since you shew yourselves unworthy of God's Word, I will speak to the fishes, so that your unbelief may be more openly confounded." Then, burning with zeal, he began to preach to the fish, reminding them of the benefits they had received from God: he had created them, had given them a limpid stream, left them perfectly free, and fed them without their having to do any work. As he preached the fish gathered together, came near the Saint, and raised their heads out of the water, while they looked at him attentively and opened their mouths. Just as if they had been gifted with reason, they listened carefully and would not leave him till they had received his blessing. This miracle seems to us no less incontestable, at least in the version by Rigaud which we have just quoted. That in the *Fioretti*, much more detailed, and more charming also to those who do not demand first and foremost care for historic truth, gives other details which are undoubtedly due to a brilliant imagination, but their authenticity is doubtful.[1]

[1] J. Rigaud, p. 89.—Sicco Polentone, p. 27.—*Liber Mir.*, p. 182—*Fioretti di Misser Sancto Francesco*, p. 53, Venice, 1543. But J. Rigaud, being far away from that district, may have possessed very little geographical knowledge, and have been mistaken as to localities.

This is, finally, all that we know about Antony's first preaching, before he went to France. But was his activity in Italy at this time confined to preaching the Gospel to the people? And what opinion should we form of the part he played there as a teacher? Here again we find ourselves confronted by very doubtful evidence, in which it is difficult to discover how much is true.

Let us reject, to begin with, the statement according to which, before beginning to teach himself, Antony went to complete his intellectual education with Thomas Gallo, the abbot of St André de Verceil, and did so with the permission of St Francis. This is found for the first time in the second legend published by Father Josa, but there is no mention of the Seraphic Patriarch. We find it again, with detailed additions and many errors, in a passage of the *Liber Miraculorum*. It says, for instance, that Antony studied for five years with this famous master. This date, if we admitted it, would upset all our calculations, and we do not see at what period Antony could then have made a stay in France. On the other hand, an unedited text by Thomas Gallo gives us more information than all the hypotheses inspired by imagination: "Many men," he says, "have penetrated the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, as I found had been done by Antony, of the Franciscan Order, during the course of the familiar relations which I had with him (*in familiari consuetudine*). Knowing little of profane science, he yet so quickly acquired a knowledge of mystic theology, that within he was on fire with heavenly ardour, and to

men he seemed lit up with divine knowledge." That is all. This text is taken from a commentary on St Denis the Areopagite, first drawn up at Verceil and afterwards edited by the famous Abbot. It does not say that the familiar relations between himself and Antony were those of master and disciple, and there is no mention whatever of a stay of five years. Moreover, it does not say it was with Thomas that Antony studied mystic theology. Nay, more, Thomas was a Canon Regular of St Victor of Paris, and we have not been able to find in the works attributed with good show of probability to Antony any clear and evident traces of the doctrines of the Victorines. We believe, and we think it well to repeat it here, that all the learning of our Saint had been acquired at Lisbon and at Coimbra. We can only admit that he conferred with Thomas of Verceil about special points on which he desired to receive detailed enlightenment or solutions for which he had long sought.[1]

We do not desire to reproduce here all the divagations of the various writers concerning the question of Antony's stay at Verceil. It has been thought that he was summoned to this town to preach Lent there; but we have not the slightest evidence for this anywhere.[2] It has been further said that at Verceil he must have known Jean

[1] Father Josa, *Alia S. Antonii Vita*, pp. 90, 91. *Liber Miraculorum*, pp. 130, 131, with note 4 of this last page. Salvagnini, p. 93, gives the text according to a MS. of the Turin Library. *Cf. Acta S.S., loc. cit.*, p. 7.

[2] Azzoguidi, note 34, p. 156.

Gersen, Abbot of St Stephen, to whom some writers have attributed the *Imitation of Christ*. Hence arise the most fantastic conjectures as to the share our Saint may have had in the compilation of this exquisite book. Not only is it impossible to discover the smallest basis for these suppositions, but, besides, we may say that the works attributed to St Antony resemble the *Imitation* neither in ideas nor style.[1]

Finally, let us reject the statement of the *Liber Miraculorum*, according to which St Antony, with Adam de Marsch, would have been the first Minorite Friar devoted to the study of Theology. But ought we at least to admit that Antony was the first Brother specially permitted to teach in the Seraphic Order? We admit it willingly, because we reject Wadding's statement that in 1216 and 1220 the Minorite Friars had schools of their own, one at Bologna, the other at Oxford.[2] We must not forget

[1] *Cf.* an article by Father Marie-Antoine of Toulouse, in the journal *l'Univers*, Aug. 24th, 1894. *L'Auteur du Traité de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ*, by Abbé Ducis, archivist of Upper Savoy. Annecy, 1876. According to the summary of it given by Father At, *Histoire de saint Antoine de Padoue*, 1895, p. 95, note, this work bristles with mistakes.

[2] Wadding, vol. ii., p. 50. We cannot here discuss the views of St Francis with regard to learning. M. le Monnier, *op. cit.*, p. 79, and M. P. Sabatier, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-329, have come to very different conclusions on the matter because they each select different evidence as being the more authoritative. But the fact that Francis, writing to our Saint, puts this address at the beginning: *Fratri Antonio, episcopo meo*, proves that the Patriarch valued learning in his spiritual son, and saw no peril in it for the latter's humility. *Cf. Seraphici Viri S. Francisci Assisinatis Vitae duae, auctore B. Thoma de Celano*, p. 236. Rome, 1806. The passage is to be found in the second life.

the fear which St Francis ever entertained in regard to learning: he feared lest it might have a regrettable influence and destroy the spirit of humility and simplicity in his religious fraternity. When he came to preach at Bologna in 1220, he severely reproached the Provincial, Pietro Stacia, not only because he had built for the Minorite Brothers a house which they said "belonged" to them, but also and more particularly because he had there established a kind of College. As Stacia, who was a Doctor of Law, did not wish to give up his enterprise, and tried to ignore Francis' prohibition, the latter cursed him without mercy. But, spite of all that has been said, nothing proves that the Saint had exaggerated or irreconcilable prejudices against learning. Besides, he was obliged to consider different circumstances and needs. As long as he was preaching, with his companions, to a people who had remained in the faith, their preaching, simple and without preparation, would have sufficed. But, in the discussions which the Minorite Brothers had to sustain in heretical countries, something more was needed: only a much more advanced knowledge could have put them in a position to reply to objections which were frequently very subtle. Let us add that Brother Elias had become Vicar-general of the Order, and, if Salimbene is right in praising him for having introduced the study of theology among the Minorite Brothers, we may suppose that he had some influence in the decision of Francis with regard to Antony. This is the text of a note attributed to the Seraphic Patriarch, in which he

confers on our Saint the right to teach: "To my very dear Brother Antony, Brother Francis, greeting in the name of Christ. My will is that you should interpret to the Brethren sacred theology, provided that a study of this kind does not quench in them the spirit of holy praise and devotion, according to the purpose of our Rule. Farewell." The authenticity of this letter has been much disputed; we have sought for the earliest version, and have stopped at that of the *Liber Miraculorum*. We cannot take it upon ourselves to affirm its authenticity. But we think in any case this note exactly represents the view of St Francis in regard to learning among the Minorite Brothers.[1]

We cannot state positively that St Antony was at first a Professor at Bologna. This point is attested only by late evidence, that of Surius and Sicco Polentone. But either way, it is only a question of very simple instruction given to the Minorite Friars. We must not take literally the expression used by Surius, and imagine that the Saint was Professor for the Theological Faculty: the University of Bologna had no such thing before the year 1360 or 1362.[2]

In any case our Saint's nomination as a lecturer to the Franciscan fraternity cannot be disputed, and it marks a decisive date in the history of the Minorite Friars. He was too profoundly convinced

[1] *Liber Miraculorum*, p. 132.

[2] Surius, p. 190; Sicco Polentone, p. 24. *Cf.* de Savigny, *Histoire du droit romain*, vol. iii., p. 133. Paris, 1839. The conscientious author gives us both dates, preferring, however, 1362.

of the necessity of theological study not to impart his own conviction to those whom he taught. If it had been merely a question of making his own ideas prevail, he would have been too full of humility to try and impose them on others. But he saw souls to be saved, and besides, among those around him, there were minds enlightened enough to understand the wants of the Church and the time's necessities. In addition there was the example of the Dominicans to excite, not the jealousy, but the holy emulation of the Franciscans. That is why St Antony was listened to when he gave his lessons, and when he taught, by example, in his preaching.

With regard to this, one historian of St Francis, M. Paul Sabatier, makes the following reflection: "When we come to St Antony of Padua . . . the decline is huge; the distance between these two men (the writer is speaking of St Francis) is as great as that which separates Jesus from St Paul.[1]" We do not see any decline here, but a necessary evolution. Besides, to judge Antony fairly, we should need to know how he taught and preached: and we can only obtain the most inadequate idea of that, as we shall see later on.

[1] P. Sabatier, *op. cit.*, p. 148. The whole question finally comes to this: Would the disciples of St Francis have had the same saving influence as their master if they had retained his methods of preaching? We do not think so. The *Poverello* owed his apostolic success to his saintliness, and perhaps also, to some extent, to the novelty of his preaching. But the people would soon have tired of this simple extempore method if the Minorite Friars had continued to employ it when preaching to them. Moreover, an uneducated preacher is usually a very poor one.

CHAPTER V

ST ANTONY IN FRANCE

WE come to a period of the Saint's life particularly difficult to deal with: it concerns the time he spent in France, and what he did there for the salvation of souls. To clear up the question we cannot here have recourse to the primitive life, which has served till now as the basis of our investigations: this legend preserves entire silence on Antony's stay in our country. However, we will endeavour to set forth, with all the precision possible, and with the most careful observation of the degree of probability of the different details, what we have been told concerning it by witnesses whose authority varies greatly. Since we have not a single definite fact to guide us with regard to the chronological order, we shall follow the one usually adopted, against which we have no serious objection to raise.

Antony, it seems, taught theology at Montpellier and afterwards at Toulouse.[1] Here we must repeat

[1] The *Liber Miraculorum* connects with his stay at Montpellier a very improbable story, which we quote only to reject. A novice is said to have stolen from Antony the annotated copy of the Psalms which he used in his lectures. The Saint began to pray. Then the devil himself undertook to bring the novice

what we said about his teaching at Bologna. If he actually did teach there, as we are inclined to think, there can have been no question of any advanced instruction. The University of Montpellier did not possess a Theological Faculty till 1421. As for the University of Toulouse, without doubt it had been legally constituted as far back as January 1217, when Honorius III. had summoned thither masters from Paris. But events had prevented the carrying out of his orders, and the energetic intervention of Gregory IX. in 1229 and the following years was required to make the University's existence secure from that time forward.[1] We must therefore suppose that St Antony's lessons were given to his Brethren, and were confined to very simple, extemporary instruction.

The south of France was at that time in a wild ferment, intensely excited by religious controversies and armed civil strife. It is very probable that St Antony used all his zeal and all his powers to defend the Catholic faith. If not at Montpellier, which had remained the impregnable fortress of orthodoxy, he certainly found at Toulouse a great field for his apostolic labours. In spite of the synod of Montpellier, when Raymond VII. of Toulouse had promised not to protect the heretics any longer, the latter did not fear to enter upon public discussions with the Catholics, and their

back to his senses, and by his threats the thief was induced to return to the Order and give back the Psalter to the Saint (p. 132).

[1] H. Denifle, *op. cit.*, pp. 340 and 325.

bishop, Guillabert de Castres, had not left the town in which he had found so many abettors.[1] Unfortunately, we have here nothing at all to tell: we cannot find out what share Antony had in the making of peace or in the pacification of the province. But we must here notice a by no means justifiable statement made by a writer of our own day.

In his work on the Cathari, C. Schmidt has misinterpreted the chapter in which Wadding, calling our Saint the tireless hammer of the heretics, tells of the ardour which he brought into his struggle against them. He has concluded somewhat too lightly that violent persecution is here meant, and he says: "St Antony of Padua, who had come to France to convert them, excites the ardour of the Crusaders against them, and causes a great number of them to be burnt."[2] The

[1] C. Schmidt, *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois*, vol. i., pp. 276 *et Sqq.* Paris, 1848.

[2] C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 281. Wadding, *op. cit.*, pp. 114, 115. Surius, p. 191. But here are the most significant passages of the latter: "Fuit autem viri Dei id praecipuum studium et conatus perpetuus, ut perniciosissimas vulpeculas, quae demoliuntur vineam Dei Sabaoth, nempe haereticos pestilentes et falsas eorum doctrinas pro viribus oppugnaret, funditus destrueret ac radicitus extirparet. . . . Nec facile quemquam ea tempestate uspiam invenire licuisset, quod ipse quoque publice fatebatur, qui tam acriter et perpetuo illos insectaretur, tamque continuam persecutionis procellam illis excitaret. Unde factum est ut passim ab omnibus indefessus haereticorum malleus diceretur." Here we have much rhetoric, no facts, and the authority of Surius is so doubtful! Moreover, Dr E. Lempp, *loc. cit.*, p. 432, thinks that Schmidt goes too far. L. Palatini, *op. cit.*, p. 27, and Salvagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 109, also protest emphatically against this pronouncement.

Franciscan annalist is only copying Surius here, who does not talk of fierce persecution, but merely tells in bombastic style of Antony's efforts and endeavours against this heresy. Besides, Surius's remark does not apply solely to France, but to Italy as well: this writer mentions not only Toulouse, but Rimini and Milan also. Now we have nowhere found that our Saint stirred up a fierce persecution of the heretics in Northern Italy.

Surius attributes to him a miracle which he is said to have worked in the district of Toulouse, similar to the one some writers place at Rimini. If it were established that he converted a heretic by making his beast of burden adore the Holy Sacrament, we should here have a proof that the Saint had recourse to the persuasive power of miracle in his controversy with the Albigensians. Unfortunately, Surius's authority is insufficient to convince us. There is unquestionably here the process of multiplication that we often come across in the Antonine biographies. It is true the same miracle may have been repeated in several places, but then each miracle must be attested by authoritative evidence.[1]

Let us leave the south of France, where the Saint has left such faint traces of his sojourn. But when we attempt to follow him into Velay they become still more indistinct. It is generally thought that he was Guardian at Puy,[2] but this rests only on

[1] Surius, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

[2] *Liber Conformitatum*, p. 76.—Surius, p. 190. *Liber Miraculorum*, p. 134. Jean Rigaud says nothing of Antony's stay at

the testimony of Surius, the *Liber Conformitatum* and the *Liber Miraculorum*. According to this latter narrative, the Saint's stay in this town was marked by the following miracle:—[1]

A lady had asked his intercession for the child she was expecting. The Saint began to pray, and then said to her: "Be of good hope and rejoice. God will give you a son who shall be great in His Church. He will become a Franciscan, shall pluck the martyr's palm, and, by his preaching, shall lead many others of the faithful to a like glory." Now all this came literally true later on. The lady gave birth to a son, who became a Minor Friar, and later on travelled into distant countries. As the town of Azot, where he happened to be, had been delivered up through treachery to the Saracens, all the Christians fell into their hands and were sentenced to death. Philip—this was the friar's name—asked to be beheaded the last of all, so that he might win his companions for God by strengthening their faith through his exhortations. He gathered them together, preached to them, confessed them, and made their faith in Jesus Christ immovably firm. When his turn came to die, as he continued his exhortation the Soldan had his hands sawn off at the wrists; then he ordered him to be flayed to the waist, and then to have his tongue slit. But the

Puy. But we cannot draw too positive conclusions from his silence.

[1] *Liber Miraculorum*, p. 134. But the text has obviously been tampered with; it speaks in one place of two thousand Christians, and, in another, of one thousand only.

martyr would not cease to preach and, to reduce him to silence, they had to decapitate him. Thus our Saint's prophecy was literally fulfilled.

Here is another incident much better known because it has been used in pictures and related contentedly by modern biographers, which also is said to have occurred at Puy. But it is told for the first time by Surius and Barthélemy of Pisa, two authorities concerning whose credibility we have already been obliged to make certain necessary reservations. While Antony was acting, then, as Guardian at Puy, there was living in the town a notary, a libertine. Every time the holy man happened to meet him he uncovered and bent his knee before him. The notary took this for mockery, was much annoyed, and arranged so that he never came across the Saint. One day, however, they accidentally came face to face, and the Saint saluted the notary in his usual way. In his exasperation the latter forgot himself so far as to say: "If I did not fear the divine anger, I would strike you with my sword to punish your mockery. What do you mean? Why do you bend your knee to me?"—"I would gladly endure martyrdom for the love of God," replied Antony, "but such is not His will. But it is revealed to me that one day you will be an illustrious martyr. When that time comes I beg you to remember me." The notary merely laughed at this idea. But not long after it happened that the Bishop of Puy, accompanied by many believers, went to Jerusalem to preach Christ to the Saracens. Moved by grace, the notary sold all his property

and went with him. When they reached Mussulman territory the bishop began to preach but, in the notary's opinion, in far too moderate a manner. He controlled himself for a while, but at last could contain himself no longer. He began to reproach the bishop. Then he addressed the Saracens, and told them with much earnestness and emphasis that Christ is true God and the Son of God, that Mahomet is an emissary of Satan and the son of Perdition. He was soon stopped and delivered over to three days of torture. As he went to his death he explained that St Antony had foretold his martyrdom, and this naturally greatly increased the devotion of all believers for the Saint.[1]

When we go into Berry, we place our foot on more solid earth. Jean Rigaud tells us that Antony preached at a synod at Bourges.[2] Dr Ed. Lempp, who came across this point in the *Liber Miraculorum*, thinks that it refers to the council held on November 30th, 1225, in which, in spite of Raymond VII.'s protests, war was resolved on against the Albigenses, and entrusted to the King of France, Louis VIII. We cannot agree with his view, and think this was merely an ordinary diocesan synod. Surely it would have been very strange for the Saint to choose the occasion of a solemn council, in which the most weighty questions were being

[1] Surius, *loc. cit.*, p. 192, and *Liber Conformitatum*, p. 76, v.

[2] J. Rigaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-88. We find that this is exactly what he says: "Fideli quorumdam fratrum relatione didici." The *Liber Miraculorum* omits this remark, a very natural thing on the part of a mere compiler.

discussed, to treat of the personal and delicate matter which we are about to mention, to reproach publicly the Archbishop of Bourges in the presence of the many prelates present there from all parts. It was in this way: preaching in some synod, Antony suddenly interrupted himself and said to the archbishop: "It is to you I am going to speak, you bearer of the mitre."[1] Then he reproached him with certain misdeeds burdening his conscience; he did this with so much fervour, fortifying his reproach with such clear and irrefutable arguments from Holy Scripture, that the archbishop was seized with remorse and moved by piety hitherto never felt by him; tears sprang to his eyes. At the end of the synod he drew the Saint on one side, disclosed to him the plague-spot on his soul, and from that time forward became very zealous in God's service, and devoted heart and soul to the Franciscan Friars.

Such is Rigaud's story, and the *Liber Miraculorum* reproduces it almost in its entirety in precisely the same terms. It is decidedly vague, and we ask ourselves what reproaches Antony could fairly have addressed to this prelate. He can have been no other than Simon de Sully, who ruled the diocese of Bourges from 1218 to 1232. Now he was the trusted friend of Pope Honorius III. and the King of France, St Louis. Later on, it is true (1231), the Chapter of St Antonin de Rodez reproached him for some neglect in making his pastoral visitations; but he replied triumphantly

[1] The Latin words are more striking still, and say: "Tibi loquar, cornute!"

to the accusation. Dr Lempp thinks that this refers to the archbishop's ill-will towards the Brothers Minor, and his opposition to the Sovereign Pontiff's recommendations. That interpretation fits in well enough with the end of the story, where it is said that the prelate's attitude towards the Sons of St Francis changed, and also with what we know of the reception accorded to the latter when they first came to France. The clergy much mistrusted this new religious family, which seemed to shun the beaten tracks and contrasted sharply with the already existing Orders. Also we know that Pope Honorius III. intervened on several occasions on their behalf, in particular to defend one of their privileges, that of having their own Office. He forbade (September 17th, 1225) the Bishop of Paris to excommunicate them, as the latter had threatened to do if they went on availing themselves of this privilege.[1] This interpretation also agrees with a passage in the second legend edited by Father Josa, but its authority, we may confess, may be doubted. Says the author of this biography: "The Brothers ought to keep him in constant remembrance as a very good man; he had the truest zeal for his Order. Whenever he heard that enemies mocked at or took advantage of the Brothers' simplicity, . . . he would at once accord to them the support of his presence. This Saint, poor and humble as he was, with

[1] *Cf.* Dr E. Lempp, in the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xii., pp. 445, 446.—Potthast, *op. cit.*, Nos. 7112, 7121, 7145, 7185, 7194. Martène, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, vol. i., p. 966.

his wisdom of the serpent was so successful in checking the growls of the hostile pack of enemies that he ensured peace for his Brethren, and by his wisdom brought to naught the lies and attacks of the proud who fought against the City of God." [1] Although this explanation may be probable, it is not really certain.

But this is all we know of St Antony's stay in Berry, if it is even true that he stayed any time there. Wadding, relying on the Parisian Pierre Rosset, whose works seem to be lost now, places the miracle of the beast of burden who bows before the Holy Sacrament at Bourges. The adversary to be converted is not now a heretic, but a Jew named Guyaud or Guyard. We have said above what our view is as to the locality where the miracle took place, and we should require more testimony than Wadding's alone before we could admit that it occurred a second time at Bourges.[2]

But we have more information with regard to the Saint's apostolic life in the Limousin, where he was Custodian at Limoges.[3] Higher than the office of Guardian and beneath that of Provincial, this position involved the controlling of a certain number of convents, and gave Antony the opportunity of travelling through the district, where we shall find him engaged in preaching to the people.

[1] The text of this legend, drawn up in very emphatic language, is almost untranslatable into French. *Alia Sancti Antonii vita*, p. 91.

[2] Wadding, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

[3] This detail, given by Surius, p. 191, is fortunately confirmed by J. Rigaud, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

It would seem that from the year 1223 onwards the Franciscans were established at Limoges, under the name of Menudets or Menydets, and perhaps he came there just at that time. Anyhow, he was there in 1226, for in that year he made a settlement of Brothers Minor in a house belonging to the Abbey of St Martin, no doubt a very small place, which the Franciscans were destined to leave seventeen years later.[1]

A manuscript chronicle belonging to St Martial, whose date, however, we have not been able to ascertain with certainty and consequently cannot vouch for its authority, tells us that Antony preached his first sermon in the cemetery of St Paul, taking as his text verse 6 of Psalm 29: *Ad vesperum demorabitur fletus, et ad matutinum laetitia.* It says

[1] We have gladly consulted M. l'abbé Arbellot's pamphlet, *Notice sur saint Antoine de Padoue en Limousin.* Paris, 1895. This work is not edited with enough critical precision, but it gives several of the MS. texts, which it is interesting to compare. But from them we have drawn conclusions differing from those of M. Arbellot. The chronicle by Pierre Coral, who was Abbot of St Martin of Limoges in 1247 (*Bibliothèque nationale*, MS. 5452) tells us that St Antony received from his Abbey in 1226 a site for an Establishment of Franciscans. But it does not say that he only came to Limoges in that year, as M. Arbellot concludes a little too lightly, in our opinion. Bernard Itier, librarian of St Martial, tells us that the Menudets came to Limoges in 1223; Pierre Coral, on the other hand, says that Antony was the first Franciscan who came to that town; finally, we know that the Menudets lived at St Paul before they went to the asylum offered them by St Martin. It seems to us that if all this s true, the conclusion to be drawn is that from 1223 Antony was at Limoges. *Cf.* Arbellot, *op. cit.*, pp. 2 and 3, and notes.

also that the Saint's second sermon was preached in the monastery of St Martin, from these words in Psalm liv., verse 7: *Quis mihi dabit pennas sicut columbae, et volabo, et requiescam?*[1] These bare statements are all: the Chroniclers are much less interested in what he said than in the miracles which he worked. We will try to relate them according to these Chroniclers, taking care, however, to distinguish between what seems to us incontestably true, and that which is attested only by doubtful authorities.

The most famous of the miracles which occurred at Limoges is the following: It was nearly midnight on Holy Thursday, in the church of Saint-Pierre du-Queyroix. At the end of matins Antony began to preach God's Word to the crowd gathered around him. Now just at this hour the Franciscans used to chant in their convent the morning-office in which our Saint, because he was custodian, had a lesson to recite. Saint-Pierre-du-Queyroix was far from the Franciscan monastery, and it seemed impossible for Antony to be among his Brethren at the right moment. That however is what did come to pass. When the precise time came Antony was silent in front of all the crowd. At the same time he suddenly appeared in the choir of his convent, sang his lesson through to the end, and at once disappeared. Then he broke through his silence at

[1] Arbellot, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 and 8. The author thinks he has found the rough sketch of these two sermons in La Haye and Azzoguidi; but unquestionably he says more than there is good warrant for on this matter.

St Pierre, and went on with his sermon to the people.[1]

Another day the Saint had called together the people of Limoges to hear a solemn exhortation. The congregation assembled in such great numbers that it was impossible to think of sheltering them in any one of the churches in the town. Antony then went with them to an old Roman amphitheatre, called the *Creux des Arènes*. At the time it was much used, and fairs and markets were held there; but, in accordance with the ideas of the period, no one saw anything unsuitable in its being used for religious ceremonies, and particularly not for preaching. Just at the moment when the audience hung upon the orator's words, a storm began, thunder growled and rain began to fall. The crowd noticed it, and showed at once an inclination to hasten away. But the Saint gently quieted them, saying: "Fear

[1] *Cf.* J. Rigaud, *op. cit.*, p. 44. The Latin text has the words *Sanctus Petrus de Quadruvio*, translated in curious guises by some of the writers. The *Liber Miraculorum*, p. 125, and Surius, p. 192, relate one after the other two such miracles of being in two places at once which are attributed to St Antony: this one which we have taken from J. Rigaud, and another which is said to have occurred at Montpellier, "during a solemn festival." The Saint is said to interrupt his preaching in a church to go to the Convent of the Franciscans where he sings the *Alleluia* at the Convent Mass. Except in these details the second miracle is exactly the same as the first. It seems probable that there is here that multiplication of events which we have already noted in the Chronicles relating to St Antony. As J. Rigaud's authority suffices for us, we retain the Limoges miracle; but we cannot help entertaining doubts concerning that at Montpellier, since we have there only the authority of Surius and the *Liber Miraculorum*.

nothing; do not go away; continue to listen to the Word of God. I ask Him in whom one never trusts in vain not to permit the rain to touch you." All those present yielded to his beseeching. They remained as long as ever it pleased the preacher to exhort them, and they suffered not at all from the rain. When they went away they noticed with extreme surprise that the ground was everywhere very wet, whilst the *Creux des Arènes* was dry. When he relates this miracle Jean Rigaud does not fail to add: "When I entered the Franciscan Order, there were still many Brothers who had been present at the sermon, and remembered the theme developed in the discourse. We must believe them on every point, since they bore witness to what their own eyes had seen and their own ears had heard." [1]

Since we have spoken of the Saint's preaching, we will relate another incident which occurred at St Junien, not far from Limoges. As in the preceding case, the crowd was too large for any church to hold it, and Antony had to go with the people to a public square. They hastily put up for him a high wooden platform, and when he mounted it he said to his audience: "I know the Enemy will attack us during my sermon. But fear nothing; his attack shall hurt no one." A little while after, the platform on which he stood gave way, but, to every one's amazement, the accident injured neither the Saint nor any of his audience. They put the platform together again, and he was listened to with

[1] J. Rigaud, p. 94.

all the profounder attention in that the people recognised in him the spirit of prophecy.[1]

At Limousin also, but in places which we cannot discover, we must locate the extraordinary incident we are about to relate. A young monk, Pierre, a native of Limoges, had been received into the Franciscan Family by Antony. But the Tempter had afterwards persuaded him to leave the Order. Antony knew of this temptation. He called the novice, opened his mouth, and said to him: "Receive the Holy Spirit!" At once the temptation ceased, and the Friar related that it never returned.[2]

In an Abbey of the Black Monks—that was the name they then gave to the Benedictins — our Saint fell ill, and a monk was appointed to look after him. This man was a prey to violent temptations of the flesh. Antony was aware of this, and gently told the monk so one day when the latter was standing before him. Then, by dint of friendly urging, he persuaded him to put on an under-tunic which he himself had left off, because it was not clean. Scarcely had the monk placed it upon his body than he was cured of his temptations for ever.[3]

We must not forget the following incident, strange as it appears. We may just note that Jean Rigaud does not say that he had it told to him by an eye-witness, as he is so eager to do whenever the opportunity occurs. Perhaps he took it from an earlier text, which we now do not know, whose authority may not be quite above suspicion.

[1] J Rigaud, p. 86. [2] *Id.*, p. 54. [3] *Id.*, p. 72.

However that may be, here is the incident as Jean Rigaud gives it. One evening, after compline, Antony was lost in prayer, as was his habit. Beneath the moonlight the Brothers, who were coming out from the Oratory, saw a big field, belonging to a good friend of the Order, full of wheat already ripe for the harvest. In it were a multitude of men, who seemed to be utterly destroying it, tearing up all the ears. The Brothers were grieved at this loss to their devoted friend, and hurried to the Saint, who was still praying, and told him with tears of their friend's misfortune. "Let it be, Brethren," replied Antony, "and return to your prayers; your enemy it is who is trying to tempt you during the night and distract you from prayer. Be sure that our benefactor's field will this time undergo neither devastation nor any damage whatsoever." The Brethren obeyed, and waited for the next day. When day came they saw that the field was unharmed, and that this had been a trick of the devil.[1]

We wish it were possible to present a fuller and more living picture of St Antony's apostolic life in the Limousin. The *Liber Miraculorum* certainly shows him to us at Solignac, and Wadding at Donzenac; but both those authorities are decidedly open to suspicion.[2] But at least we know from Jean Rigaud that at Brive he founded the first Franciscan monastery, and this author tells us in this connexion the following story: The house

[1] J. Rigaud, pp. 66-68.

[2] *Liber Mirac.*, p. 126, and Wadding, vol. ii., p. 252.

was naturally poor, as was right for sons of St Francis. One day the cook had nothing wherewith to prepare a meal for the Brethren. Antony told this to a lady who was devoted to them, and begged her to send from her garden leeks and other vegetables to make a meal for his Brothers. As it happened, on that day rain fell in torrents. The lady called her servant, and, by dint of begging, induced her to go into the garden, gather the required vegetables, and then take them to the Franciscan monastery. This house was at a considerable distance, and the rain continued. None the less the servant was not wet, her clothes were not even touched. Pierre de Brive, this lady's son, heard the story from his mother. When later on he became Canon of Noblac, he loved to tell it for the Saint's greater glory.[1]

According to a tradition which unfortunately is only mentioned by the *Liber Miraculorum*, Antony experienced at Brive a desire to lead a more retired life for a time, to give himself up to severer penance and more continuous contemplation. For this purpose he is said to have chosen a grotto outside the town, where he hollowed out a fountain by its side to receive the water which gushed from the rock. We could wish this point was attested by another authority than the *Liber Miraculorum's*, to increase the confidence of the pilgrims who

[1] J. Rigaud, p. 60. On the Sunday which follows the feast of St Bartholomew, there is an annual Fair at Brive, called the "Onion-Fair." The inhabitants connect it with the miracle we have just related. But we think this merely a tradition without foundation, and mention it only as a rather curious point.

go to visit the grotto, and to drink of the stream, both being marked only by the oral tradition of the locality.[1]

We have the same desire with regard to the other miracles which the Saint is said to have worked in the Limousin, that is, we wish we could confirm them by less doubtful authority than that of the collection we have just quoted. We must, however, briefly mention them, if only to put our readers on their guard against the biographers who have too easily admitted their genuineness. These miracles are said to have been worked on behalf of persons who attended St Antony's preaching, or showed special sympathy for the Franciscan Family. A woman who had returned from listening to the Saint found her son, a tiny child, playing in a vessel of boiling water! Another left her son in his cradle to go and hear Antony preaching; when she came home the child was dead. She ran to the Saint, and besought him with tears to work a miracle for her. Antony said to her three times: "Go, for God will show you His mercy." She went back home and found her son alive again, and playing with some small pebbles. Another, who at times looked after the needs of the Franciscan Brethren, was once kept a very long time by the work she was doing for them. When she returned, her husband, who did not share her sympathies, reproached her, and she unwisely replied. Then he seized her by the hair and dragged her about till it was nearly all torn out. Next day she begged Antony to come,

[1] *Liber. Mirac.*, p. 127.

as she was not well: he came immediately, as he thought he would have to receive her confession. She told him what had happened, and added, full of confidence: "If you would only pray to God for me I am sure He would give me back my hair just as I had it before." The Saint replied: "You made me come here for that? Adieu!" Still, when he got back to the Brethren, he told them of the matter, and invited them to pray with him for the woman. At once she had her hair restored to her just as it had been before. Her amazed husband entirely altered his attitude towards the Franciscans, and was thereafter much devoted to them.[1]

We will not delay over other tales, still more doubtful, which we have found in the same collection. At the same time we will take from it one miracle, which certainly is no better attested than the others, but it occupies a place somewhat apart in the legendary history of the Saint, and according to some writers it too occurred at Limousin.

While Antony was preaching in a town whose name is not mentioned, a citizen offered him hospitality, and gave him a room alone by itself so that he might give himself up more undisturbedly to study and contemplation. While his guest prayed, the man kept coming and going up and down the house. Curiosity made him constantly look at the room whither Antony had withdrawn: then he saw, through a window which looked into the room, a beautiful and delightful child whom Antony was holding in his arms, kissing again and again as he

[1] *Liber. Mirac.*, pp. 133 and 126.

looked at its face. The astonished man asked himself where this lovely child could possibly come from. It was Jesus Himself, who had revealed to His servant the citizen's indiscreet curiosity. When the divine Child had departed, Antony forbad his host to speak of this occurrence while he himself still lived. When the Saint was dead, the happy witness of the miracle related it with tears of emotion, and after he had touched the holy relics that he might better bear testimony to the truth of the incident.[1]

The Antonine biographers have thrown no doubt upon this, and some have even not feared to add other details to the story in the *Liber Miraculorum*. Let us note only the following, because it shows how legends are made or embellished. In the seventeenth century, when it became customary to represent St Antony with the Child Jesus, they did not wish to deprive the Saint of the two emblems he already possessed: the book and the opened lily. To combine these attributes as gracefully as possible they often used to place —as, be it said, they usually still do to-day—the Child Jesus on the book, closed or open. From this it has been concluded that the Infant Jesus was upon a book when he appeared to Antony.[2]

The same biographers have taken much trouble to decide the place where this is supposed to have occurred. Some cling to Limousin, and others even go so far as to specify the exact spot, the castle which has given its name to Châteauneuf-la-Forêt,

[1] *Liber. Mirac.*, p. 133. [2] *Cf.* Azevedo, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

between Limoges and Eymoutiers. Missaglia says that it was at Camposampiero, in the territory of Count Tiso. Azevedo agrees that it was on this Count's estates, but at Padua, of which he had become a citizen. We will not linger to discuss these hypotheses, simply because the incident itself has not been proved to have occurred at all.[1]

We are much more at our ease when we come to speak of a miracle whose authenticity decidedly cannot be questioned, although the date cannot be fixed with any certainty. St Antony had gone to the town of Arles, in Provence, to be present at a Chapter of Franciscans, and he there preached concerning the inscription on the Cross, and the sufferings which Jesus Christ endured for our sakes. For a moment one of the Brothers, Monaud or Monaldo, raised his eyes and was witness of an apparition well calculated to amaze him. St Francis himself, who was still alive and in Italy, had condescended to come and honour his disciple's preaching. He seemed to rest in the air, his arms stretched out in form of a cross. When he had blessed the assembly, making over it the sign of the Cross, he disappeared.

[1] Abbé Arbellot, *Notice sur Saint Antoine de Padoue*, pp. 45-49, gives his vote for Châteauneuf, basing his decision on authorities which are of no value. But he cannot get over this objection: if there is any question of a lord and a castle, why does the only account we have speak of a town and a citizen? Azevedo, *op. cit.*, p. 393, Dissert. XXXV. votes for Padua and Count Tiso. He very cleverly gets out of the difficult term "burgensis," by saying that Count Tiso had caused himself to be admitted as a citizen of Padua, which is perfectly true. But it does not make Azevedo's opinion any more worth having.

This incident is one of the most firmly established amongst all those we have met with in our attempt to place St Antony's life on a trustworthy basis. It is attested both by writers who have only concerned themselves with the life of the Patriarch of Assisi, as well as by others who have traced out the life of our Saint. It occurred before the 3/4 October 1226, which was the date of the death of St Francis, but very probably after September 1224.[1]

We do not know if Antony visited Provence several

[1] *Cf.* Thomas de Celano, *Vita Prima*, part i., chap. xviii., p. 41. St Bonaventure, who, however, has copied this author, also gives this incident in his *Legenda St Francisci*, *Operum*, vol. vii., p. 286, col. 2, *Moguntiae*, 1609. He expressly states that Antony was commentating on the words *Jesus Nazarenus*, *Rex Judaeorum*, and he mentions that St Francis himself told the tale to several of his companions. We must not forget the very important evidence of Bartholomew of Trent, of which the Bollandists, *apud Acta SS.*, Juin., vol. iii., p. 196, have preserved a fragment for us, where this fact is attested. To appreciate rightly the evidence of this preaching friar, it is well to remember that he knew our Saint personally, and that the *Gesta Sanctorum*, whence comes this fragment, dates back to a time very near to the Saint's death, that is, to 1244.

Among Antony's biographers who mention this incident we hesitate to cite the *Chronique de XXIV. Généraux*, p. 24, which, moreover, only gives it three lines. But we will add the accepted testimony of J. Rigaud (*op. cit.*, p. 84), and above all of the *Vita auctore anonymo*, published by the Bollandists (in the volume we have quoted above). We find, besides, in the Franciscan Office for St Antony, at the Vesper hymn, another piece of evidence which at the same time contains a very precious detail. This hymn contains the following verse :—

" Hic stigmatum qui bajulo
Patri natus innititur,
Dum praedicat de titulo,
Confixus ille cernitur."

times. Therefore we think it well to narrate here a miracle which he worked there. Accompanied by a Franciscan Brother, he was journeying through a small town, and the meal-time had long passed. A poor woman of the place, learning that he and his companion were both hungry, invited the two Friars to come and take their meal with her. As eager as Martha, she placed bread and wine on the table, and went to borrow a wine-glass from a neighbour. In her excitement she forgot to turn off the cask's tap, so that nearly all her wine was spilt. Moreover, Antony's companion took the glass so clumsily that he broke off the foot. When the hostess, at the end of the meal, went again to the cask, she saw the mishap which her foolishness had caused, and came and told our Saint about it. He began to pray, his head bent upon his hands. In a moment the two ends of the glass united again, and the hostess saw that the glass was whole. Encouraged by this first miracle, she ran to the cellar. With joy she beheld the cask, which before the accident was scarcely half full, full now almost to overflowing. Then Antony hastened to depart, to seek a refuge for his humility.[1]

According to this, St Francis had already received the stigmata when he appeared to the Chapter at Arles: now the Saint's stigmatisation occurred in 1224, very probably in September. This hymn, if we may believe Glassberger, was composed when Jean Parenti was General, that is, in 1233 at the latest. In any case, its date is before 1249, for the Office of which it forms a part was in use among the Franciscans at that time. *Cf. Chronica Fratris Nicolai Glassberger*, vol. ii. of the *Analecta Francisc.*, p. 91.

[1] J. Rigaud, p. 50. This writer says explicitly that Antony then left the Limousin to go to Italy. But we do not know if he went on this journey several times.

To sum up, we have only a very fragmentary idea of St Antony's doings during his stay in France. No one has questioned that he did visit the south, Montpellier and Toulouse, the centre, that is to say Bourges and Limousin, and finally Provence. But as for the miracles attributed to him, we can only cling to those attested by Jean Rigaud.[1] As regards the appearance of St Francis, which rests on such well-authenticated evidence, it but proves the Patriarch's affection for his disciple, and not Antony's miraculous power.

[1] However, we have made an exception as regards the story of the devastated field.

CHAPTER VI

RETURN TO ITALY

ACCORDING to the most commonly accepted view, although it is based only on probability, St Antony left France a short time after the death of St Francis, that is to say at the end of 1226, or in 1227. As we have stated earlier in the book, Mariano of Florence, who endeavoured to account for all the Sicilian foundations attributed to St Antony by local traditions, conjectured that our Saint had been cast by the tempest on the coast of Sicily when, after having embarked at Marseilles, he wished to reach northern Italy. We have expressed our feeling concerning this unlikely view.[1] We find in this view only another proof of the boldness with

[1] We quote the opinion of Mariano in conformity with Wadding, *op. cit.*, p. 118. In our conclusion we are in agreement with the Bollandist Suysken. Our edition was finished when we became acquainted with the recent publication of M. P. Sabatier *Fratris Fr. Bartholi de Assisio Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula.* Paris, 1900. The editor protests against the view of the Bollandist (pp. 137-144), and we must take into consideration the opinion of a scholar who has examined so thoroughly the history of the beginnings of the Franciscan Order. But until he gives us a rehabilitation in due form of Mariano we think we must maintain our view : we cannot imagine that so many imaginary stories and fictitious facts have been falsely attributed to this Chronicler.

which certain writers, living long after our Saint, have tried to eke out his too short biography by means of their imagination.

Some assert, on the other hand, that he was present at the Chapter held at Assisi, about Whitsuntide, for the election of the Minister-general, who on this occasion was Jean Parenti (1227). But proofs are lacking in support of this statement also. It is conjectured that, as Custodian of Limoges, he was obliged to take part in this Chapter; but there is no proof that he still occupied this office. It is also said that this year, and probably at the Chapter which has just been mentioned, he was made Provincial of Emilia, which is also called Romagna. Here again proofs are to be desired. The early legend tells us indeed that when the relics of St Francis were removed in 1230, he was discharged from the duty of administering the Sacrament to the Brothers. But we do not know what office he then filled in the Order. The earliest testimony on this point is that of Surius, which is not strong enough to re-assure us.[1]

We are thus in the greatest uncertainty concerning the life and deeds of St Antony from his return from France until the time when he arrived in Padua in 1229. It is true that Azzoguidi, depending entirely on the evidence of Angelico da Vicenza, gives us a

[1] Surius, *op. cit.*, p. 190. The text runs: "Tu Æmiliae provincia permultis annis fratrum Minister cum laude fuit." We do not see how the Saint could have been for such a long time Provincial of Emilia. We have another proof of how inexact is the author's method of writing.

very complete and detailed picture of the Saint's doings during this period of time. Here, shortly, is what he tells us of his travels and his labours. In 1227 St Antony was at Rimini labouring at the conversion of heretics, and having recourse, if need were, to the power of miracles. From Rimini he went to Aquilaea, Goritz, Udine, Gemona, Conegliano, preaching, performing miracles, and founding Franciscan convents. In 1228 he paid a flying visit to Trevisia and Venice, and arrived at Padua on Ash Wednesday in order to preach the Lenten sermons in that town. At the request of the inhabitants he drew up sermons for this service, and other sermons *de Tempore*. Afterwards he went to Ferrara, then to Bologna, where he wrote his sermons on the Psalms. He then preached at Florence sermons during Advent and the ensuing Lent at the request of the Minister-general, Jean Parenti, himself a Florentine. With this Lent we have now reached the year 1229. St Antony then began again a visitation of the province which was entrusted to his charge; he went to Milan where he attacked the Vaudois in his preaching, then he went to Vercelli, Varese, Brescia and Breno; his visitation which reached as far as Verona and the monasteries on the shores of Lake Garda, was concluded at Mantua. In 1230, after the meeting of the Chapter which ordained the removal of St Francis of Assisi's relics, he was sent to Rome by the Minister-general to obtain from Pope Gregory IX. an official interpretation of the will left by the Seraphic Patriarch. He then went to Alverna and to Padua, in the

month of September, and finally to Verona where he harangued Ezzelino. He then returned to Padua where he ended the year by lecturing on theology, composing sermons, and attacking heresy. As to the year 1231 it is sufficiently described, with the particularly interesting point that the Saint is shown working innumerable miracles down to the time which immediately precedes his death.

Now, all that we have just described is a mass of hypotheses, which rests on no solid foundation. Father Angelico da Vicenza collected in the eighteenth century traditions of no value, and those who have used the material amassed by him have been obliged to arrange it in a certain chronological order by consulting the map of Italy. But they have not been able to do what was really essential, that is, find the authorities on which they could rely. Father Luigi da Missaglia, Father Arbusti, Father Azzoguidi, and last of all Father Emanuele de Azevedo, when they altered dates to make them more acceptable, have not given to the details the authenticity that was lacking to them. We may add that there are absolutely improbable things in these accounts. They admit that St Antony was Provincial of Emilia. But this office necessitated a residence in that district, which was incompatible with the frequent journeys which these authors claim for him, and it also prevented his performing the duty of Lector, which, according to them, he discharged whilst at Padua. We thought, nevertheless, we ought to refer to these stories, because they have been adopted almost

without criticism by nearly all the writers who have written the biography of St Antony in our own times, and because we thought we ought to enlighten the mind of our readers.[1]

A similar motive urges us to recall certain miracles, the authenticity of which is no better demonstrated, but which are related in almost all lives of our Saint. As these are usually said to have taken place in Italy, it appears to us that this is the right moment for mentioning them. First of all here are those which are related in the *Liber Miraculorum*.

Being invited to dinner by some heretics, St Antony sat down to table with them. A revelation informed him that the dishes placed before him were poisoned, and he thought it was his duty to reproach his hosts with their conduct. They replied that they had acted thus in order to test through him this text from the Bible: "And if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them." St Antony made the sign of the cross over the dishes, saying at the same time he was about to partake of them, not to tempt God, but

[1] We cannot show here all the improbability of the narrative to which the authors in question have given credence. We must content ourselves with referring our readers to Father de Azevedo's book. *Cf.* also Dr. E. Lempp's article in the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, pp. 449, 450, vol. xii. Our readers know already the title of the works of Arbusti and Azzoguidi. Angelico da Vicenza's book is entitled: *la Vita di S. Antonio di Padova, colla storia della sua sepultura, canonizzazione, traslazione e dei miracoli da lui dopo morte operati.* Bassano, 1748. Lastly Father Luigi da Missaglia published at Parma in 1776 his *Vita di Sant' Antonio di Padova.*

to show his zeal for their well-being, and his belief in the Gospel. He suffered no ill results from this, and the unbelievers embraced the Catholic religion.

On another occasion a penitent came to confess to him, and he experienced such an intense feeling of contrition that he could not utter a single word. The Saint said to him: "Go home; write down your sins; and then bring me the account of them." When the penitent had obeyed him he saw that the sheet of paper was blank, and that his sins had been effaced.[1]

We will not stop to refer to the less striking miracles, such as that by which St Antony healed a child who had been deprived from his birth of the use of his feet and arms, or that by which he cured a little girl of epilepsy. We will rather hasten to describe those which tradition has preserved with particular care.[2]

One day, a woman was anxious to hear the Saint's preaching. But she had a sick husband, who did not allow her to go away from him. Her house was about two miles distant from the place where the Saint was preaching. The woman opened the window to see at least what was happening there. To her great delight she heard all that St Antony was saying in his sermon. Her husband, after having refused to believe in the miracle, was compelled to bear witness to the truth, and become from that time henceforth entirely devoted to the miracle-worker.[3]

[1] *Lib. Mirac.*, pp. 124 and 134. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 136 and 137.
[3] *Lib. Mirac.*, p. 137. The *Liber Conform.*, p. 76 r°, places this miracle in the town of Puy.

Without wishing to exhaust this subject entirely we shall now relate, in order not to return to the subject later on, two miracles, the scene of which certain authors place at Padua. The more celebrated is that of the leg that was amputated and then set. It is told by J. Rigaud, and occurs in the Lucerne manuscript, and in the *Liber Miraculorum*, not to mention authors who have copied these earlier narratives. Unfortunately, we cannot assign it with certainty to our Saint. As a matter of fact it is attributed to St Peter Martyr, of the order of Preaching Friars, by his biographer and contemporary, Thomas of Leontino, who relates it with almost the same details. Moreover, although the Franciscan writers continue to claim it for their thaumaturgist, St Antoninus, who was also a Preaching Friar, gives the glory of it to St Peter Martyr. However that may be, here is the deed as told by J. Rigaud.

A young man went to confess to the Saint. Among other sins he declared that he had struck his mother so violently with his foot that she fell down. The Saint told him to go to her and humbly implore her pardon. She replied thereupon: "I would certainly pardon you, but I do not believe that God will pardon you for such a crime." The young man, greatly troubled, went to his room, and with an axe cut off the foot with which he had struck his mother. Upon hearing his cries and those of his mother, the neighbours came running up. The Saint was passing by at that moment, and entering the house he recognised his penitent.

He had the severed foot brought to him, placed it close to the leg which had been amputated, and immediately the two were joined: the young man was cured of his wound, and delivered from his grief.[1]

Here are two other miracles no less carefully preserved by legend, which remain, however, still more doubtful. The first is vouched for by the evidence of Surius and the *Liber Conformitatum*; the second by a sermon at the beginning of the fourteenth century, falsely attributed to St Bonaventure, and now regarded as apocryphal.

The father of the Saint, according to the earliest tradition, was still living when the latter was dwelling at Padua. Now it happened that two gentlemen in Lisbon had a deadly hatred for one another, and one of them was so entirely beside himself with hatred that he killed his enemy's son. After he had committed the crime he could think of no better expedient for escaping the punishment he had incurred than to bury his victim in the night in the garden of St Antony's parents. After a long search the body was discovered, and the father of our Saint, with all his family, was thrown into prison to answer for a crime of which he was innocent. The man of God learnt of all this by means of a revelation. That same evening he asked permission

[1] J. Rigaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-78. According to the text the miracle took place in Spain; doubtless this is an error of the copyist. *Cf. Lib. Mirac.*, p. 138, Sicco Polentone, in Azzoguidi, p. 32, and the *Liber Conform.*, p. 81, which adds an imaginary detail. *Cf.* also *Vita sancti Petri Martyris, per Thomam de Leontino, coaevum, ord. Præd.*, in *Acta SS.* April, vol. iii., p. 700.

to absent himself, and this was easily granted him; the next morning at break of day he was in Lisbon. He went to the judge, and not being able to obtain from him the release of his relatives, he asked that the child, at any rate, might be brought to him. He restored him to life, and commanded him to say whether those who were accused of the crime were innocent. When the child had revealed the truth, the parents of our Saint were set at liberty. St Antony remained with them during the whole of that day, and next day was brought back to Padua by angelic agency.[1]

Here is the second incident to which we referred: St Antony was invited to preach at the funeral of a usurer, and he took as the text for his sermon this passage from the Gospel; "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." In the course of his sermon he said, using another passage from the Bible, "The rich man died, and was carried to hell." Then he added, "Go to the place where this man kept his money, and there you will find his heart, even though his body is already buried." The relatives and friends of the deceased obeyed this injunction,

[1] Surius, *op. cit.*, p. 193. *Liber Conformitatum*, p. 76. We saw earlier that the parents of our Saint, according to Sicco Polentone, died early. We said also that this statement was not proved. Were it so it would make this miracle of necessity impossible. Miguele Pacheco (*Cf. Acta Sanct.*, vol. iii., June, p. 201) relates another miracle of being in two places at once performed in the same way by St Antony for the deliverance of his father. On this occasion Martins was arrested on a charge of embezzlement. But Pacheco's evidence is of less value than that of those to whom we have just referred.

and they found his heart still warm among the coins in his safe.[1]

These facts are highly improbable, and we have no serious evidence in support of them; they show us the audacity of narrators, and the credulity of certain biographers, who have no idea of historical criticism. We are now going to record the power of imagination to amplify a very well ascertained fact, concerning which, unfortunately, the earliest biographer gives us too few details.

This biographer tells us of a journey which St Antony made to Rome when he was sent by the Minister-general to the pontifical court to discuss certain matters relating to his Order. He was received very graciously by the Sovereign Pontiff and the Sacred College, who listened to his preaching very devoutly. He discoursed of the Scriptures in so learned and eloquent a manner that the Pope called him familiarly "The Ark of the Covenant." Here the authentic narrative stops.[2] It does not tell us who was the Pope to whom St Antony was

[1] The Brothers Minor of the College of St Bonaventure at Quaracchi, near Florence, have undertaken a critical edition of their patron's works. In the first volume of this publication, *S. Bonaventurae Opera omnia*, vol. i., p. xiii., 1882, they reject the authenticity of two sermons, one of which is that to which we refer. These two sermons are to be found in the edition of St Bonaventure's works by Borde, Lyons, 1678, vol. iii., p. 261. *Cf.* also the *Liber Conformit.*, p. 76 r°, where, on revising our work, we have just seen this story.

[2] *Portugall. Monum. hist.*, p. 119. We have translated as "Minister-general" the Latin expression "Minister ordinis." If we have accurately understood the passage, and if the author has employed the right term, this would refer here to Jean Parenti,

sent. Wadding, following many other authors whose evidence is very doubtful, asserts that it was Gregory IX. This is possible as that Pope succeeded to the Pontifical chair on March 19th, 1227, and ruled until 1241, long after the death of our Saint. But it is not impossible that the Sovereign Pontiff, who received our Saint, might have been the predecessor of Gregory IX., namely Honorius III., and we do not possess the details necessary to settle the question.[1]

This is what the *Liber Miraculorum* adds to the information recorded by the early legend. One day at the command of the Pope, the most holy father, St Antony of Padua, was preaching to an assembly of innumerable pilgrims—Greek, Italian, French, Teuton, Slav, English, as well as others who all spoke different languages, and who had all come there, attracted by the crowd, and by the desire to obtain indulgences. Then the Holy Spirit came to the help of our blessed Saint in such a way that all those present understood him perfectly, and each heard him in his own language. He discoursed with so profound and moving an eloquence that his listeners were filled with astonishment and admiration, and that is why the Pope called him the Ark of the Testament. We simply relate this circum-

who was Minister-general from 1227 to 1233. During the lifetime of St Francis the Supreme head of the Order was called Vicar-general.

[1] If it was Jean Parenti who sent our Saint to Rome—as is most probable—then the Pope was certainly Gregory IX. Jean Parenti was elected during the first year of the former's pontificate, and did not cease to be Minister-general till after the death of St Antony.

stance, and regret that it is not supported by more reliable evidence.[1]

But a certain number of chroniclers and biographers have gone much further: they do not hesitate to show us, sometimes with the addition of many details, the object which St Antony had in view in his journey to Rome. We are obliged to enter into explanations here, which we shall endeavour to make complete without incurring the reproach of being too prolix.

There was even during the lifetime of St Francis a divergence of views among the Franciscan Brethren, and a secret disagreement concerning the religious life that they ought to lead. These dissensions increased among the Franciscans after the death of their founder, and they ended later in the separation of the Spirituals. Matters had not, it is true, reached this point at the time of St Francis' death. Still there were already many discussions concerning the right way of interpreting the definitive Rule bequeathed by him. The reforming party demanded that it should be interpreted in relation to certain particular points. The conservative

[1] *Liber Miracul.*, pp. 121, 122. The text says "Qui illuc propter indulgentias et concilium venerant." We have translated "concilium" by the word "assemblée" (assembly), not venturing to assert that it refers here to a council. Still we may observe that in 1228 Gregory IX. held a council in Rome against Frederick II. As to the indulgences referred to, it appears that they were obtained at Easter, but not at a jubilee. The first jubilee was instituted in the year 1300 by Pope Boniface VIII. Bartholomew of Pisa, in the *Liber Conformitatum*, p. 76 r°, speaks of a "consistory" at which the Saint preached: we have already expressed our opinion concerning this compiler.

party, those who upheld literal observance, replied that all explanation was entirely superfluous, and that the letter of the law must be kept seeing that this Rule was quite clear as it stood. At the Chapter-general, which took place after the death of St Francis, this party was in the ascendency; it nominated as Minister-general one of its members, the pious Jean Parenti, to the exclusion of Brother Elias, who had fulfilled the duties of this office since 1222, under the title of Vicar-general.

This seems the right moment for making our readers acquainted with this Franciscan Brother, whom the Chroniclers have described to us under such different aspects.[1] He played a part of the utmost importance in the history of the Franciscans, and we shall have to discuss the attitude of St Antony towards him.

It is quite certain that from the intellectual point of view, Brother Elias was one of the most gifted men of his time. He was born in a suburb of Assisi, of poor parents, and his youth was spent in making mattresses with them. Without any training he became a schoolmaster in his native town, and he had lived for some time at Bologna as *scriptor*, when he came to St Francis and asked him to grant him admission to his religious Order. No sooner had

[1] The Brothers Minor, who upheld the Rule exactly as it was laid down by St Francis, treat with great severity the man who made great efforts to modify it; those who approve of these modifications have been more indulgent towards him. A formal rehabilitation of Brother Elias was made in the last century by Father Ireneo Affo, sub-librarian to the Duke of Parma, in his *Vita di frate Elia*, Parma, 1783.

he entered the Order than he displayed the resources of his fine intelligence, indeed we may say his genius for organisation. He had great understanding of men's characters, and was skilful in weighing and balancing circumstances, and he knew how to reap advantage from both men and circumstances with supreme cleverness. Although his views were very different from St Francis', he was employed by him on many important duties, a fact that showed the great confidence the Seraphic Patriarch had in him. Although he had not yet been ordained a priest he was chosen at the Chapter of 1216 Minister for Tuscany, the most important province of the Franciscan Order. In a short time the number of Lesser Brethren there was almost doubled, and their Houses were noted for their splendid order. When St Francis in 1217 was not able to go to Egypt himself, he appointed Elias Provincial of the Houses beyond the seas; and when the latter went to the Soldan's country, he distinguished himself by the conversion of a very remarkable person, one Cæsar of Spire. Before the Chapter of 1221, the first at which St Antony was present, Elias succeeded Peter of Catani, and, as we have mentioned earlier in the book, discharged these duties until the death of St Francis.

He was present at his death, and was blessed by the Saint, not only as the representative of the whole religious Order, but as his friend and much-loved son. Elias then wrote a circular letter, announcing the death of the Patriarch to the Provincial ministers, which showed intense attachment for St Francis.

He could appreciate the moral beauty of his soul, and the sublimity of the religious life which he had seen him lead. Nevertheless, he had thought that the Franciscan Rule should be adapted to the needs of the age, and he had made many efforts for this purpose, but without success. But he had always acted with moderation, and we cannot believe that during the lifetime of St Francis he had incurred any severe reproaches.

Once, however, removed from the gentle influence of his spiritual father, he no longer hesitated to pursue the accomplishment of his plans. His ideal was to make the Brothers Minor a powerful and disciplined Order; powerful so that it might be able to resist its enemies in the attempts which they made to place obstacles in the way of its work, and disciplined because the rapid growth of the Franciscan Order demanded this if disorders were to be avoided. What St Francis had desired to do simply by charity, humility and poverty, Elias wished to do by means also of energy and good management. Unfortunately, as with so many men of his stamp, he did not sufficiently trouble about the moral value of the means which he employed, and it was this that ruined him later on when he had ceased to pay attention to anyone's judgment but his own.[1]

[1] *Cf.* P. Sabatier, *op. cit.*, pp. 233, 234 with the notes. The Abbé Le Monnier, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 50, 53 et passim. We greatly regret that we were not able to consult, when correcting the proofs of this book, the work of Dr E. Lempp, which is to be published very soon under the title of *Brother Elias of Assisi*. The German scholar assures us, however, that his conclusions,

The greatest reserve must be maintained in judging of the events in which, according to the Chroniclers, Brother Elias took a part. The mere comparison of the texts shows the numberless anachronisms they committed in narrating his life, and, of course, the very defective power of criticism which they possessed. Besides, all those who regretted the modifications introduced into the original Rule made him responsible for them, and consequently they painted him in the blackest of colours; they have ascribed to him legends which are entirely inadmissible, without verifying them, and sometimes even adding to them.

That must be our conclusion in attempting to describe the end of his life, and to show the character of his relations with St Antony.[1]

Between the death of the Patriarch of Assisi (3rd or 4th October, 1226), and the election of Jean Parenti (June 1227), Brother Elias governed all the Brothers Minor for the time being. When the new General was appointed he was bidden by Pope Gregory IX. to superintend the construction of a church at Assisi, which was to be less modest than the Portiuncula, and was to receive the mortal remains of St Francis.[2] He discharged all the duties of his

with regard to the relations between St Antony and Brother Elias, are almost the same as those he brought forward in the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xiii., pp. 1-19.

[1] We notice that M. P. Sabatier—and we impugn neither his knowledge nor his impartiality—has become more and more severe towards Brother Elias the more he studies the documents connected with the party strictly attached to the original Rule.

[2] This church was probably not begun till after the canonisation

new office with his accustomed activity and energy: thanks to him, to his zeal in the collection of alms, and to the impulse which he gave to good works, the church was finished in 1230, and the Pope was able to authorise the Franciscans to remove thither the mortal remains of their founder. It is said, moreover, that Brother Elias was not so greatly absorbed in the cares of his office as to be unable to take an active part in the management of his Order by opposing the plans of the gentle Jean Parenti. Unfortunately we know nothing of his relations with St Antony until 1230; what certain writers tell us is pure imagination, to which no importance can be attached.[1] But in this year 1230, and on account of the Chapter which met at

of the Saint in July, 1228; but all had been prepared in advance owing to the exertions of Brother Elias. *Cf.* Le Monnier, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 447, 448.

[1] We cannot, however, resist the desire to quote the following anecdote which will show how fantastically, or perhaps still more, how ignorantly, certain Chroniclers travesty facts. Angelo Clareno in his *Chronica Septem Tribulationum* relates to us this strange circumstance: "St Antony, whose relics are at Padua, did not escape this tribulation. When he came from Sicily (*Cecilia*) to Assisi to see the relics of St Francis, he was seized, stripped and beaten, till the blood ran, by the agents of Brother Elias." Further, the chronicle shows us St Antony as being at the same time "fratrem peregrinum, incognitum et extraneæ nationis et mente captum." We have no need to point out the improbability of this story, which our readers will easily understand after what has already been related by us. *Cf.* Dr Lempp in the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xiii., pp. 15 and 16, and the notes; also Salvagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 125, and note, and finally, Father Ehrle in the *Archiv für Literat.—— und Kirchengeschichte*, where the learned monk tries in vain to give an air of probability to this story by placing it in the years 1226-1230.

Assisi for the transference of the relics, there were incidents connected with both St Antony and Brother Elias with which we will now deal.

First of all we will relate what Thomas of Eccleston has reported, as his evidence is least open to doubt. He was writing after 1260, at a time not far removed from the events described, but he lived in England, and the story which reached him was biassed by the passions of the party opposed to change. This is what he tells us of the Chapter-general of 1230. Brother Elias, although he was not Minister-general, had granted permission to all the Brothers who were well disposed towards him to go to Assisi to record their votes on his behalf. This was contrary to custom, for the inferior monks could no longer be present at Chapters-general. His supporters went to seek him out in his cell to enthrone him as Minister-general in place of Jean Parenti, and with this object they broke open the door of the Chapter House. Seeing this, Parenti took off his robes of office in the presence of all; a great riot ensued, and the conspirators retired in confusion. "The latter," Eccleston expressly states, "would pay no attention to St Antony or to any of the Provincials." They were sent to the various provinces to do penance. As to Brother Elias, he retired to a hermitage, and allowed his beard and his hair to grow as a sign of repentance, and in this way became reconciled to the whole Order. The Chapter then sent to Gregory IX. official delegates to explain to him the Franciscan Rule; these were, as well as the Minister-general Parenti, St Antony,

Brother Rusinol, penitentiary of the Pope, Brother Haymon, who later became Minister-general, Brother Leon, who afterwards became Archbishop of Milan, Brother Gerald of Modena, Brother Peter of Brescia. They related to him the behaviour of Elias, laying stress on the fact that he had caused the relics of St Francis to be transferred before the Brethren had come to Assisi. Gregory IX. was much displeased at this, and remained vexed with Brother Elias until he learned of his doing penance.

Here ends what Thomas of Eccleston has to tell us concerning St Antony.[1] The Chronicler does not mention him again in his account, nor in his description of the interview when Gregory IX. dismissed Brother Elias from his office of Minister-general, for this did not take place till 1339. Whatever may be the value of this Chronicler, and we think it would be going too far to reject his account entirely, St Antony plays in it a part consistent with all we know of his character. He dissuades those who are discontented from carrying out a *coup d'Etat* they had planned, and he is one of the envoys whom the Chapter-general sent to the Sovereign Pontiff to explain the differences which troubled the harmony of the Franciscan Order. But the chronicle of Glassberger goes much further.[2] It tells us, con-

[1] *Fratris Thomae Eccleston Liber de Adventu Fratrum in Angli am*, pp. 241-247, in the *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. i. Quaracchi, 1885.

[2] *Chronica Fratris Nicolai Glassberger* in the *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. ii., pp. 50-52, 1887. We did think of giving, instead of Glassberger's account, the version in the *Chronicles of the twenty-four Generals*, pp. 213-215, and especially pp. 229-231.

cerning the part played by St Antony at this junction, other details the authenticity of which appears to us more than suspicious. We will give them as briefly and as exactly as possible. At the Chapter of 1230 Brother Elias desired to appease the Brothers Minor, whom he had vexed on account of his secret removal of St Francis' body. With this object in view, he brought forth privileges which he had obtained surreptitiously from Rome, which would affect the purity of the Franciscan Rule. In order to make them acceptable to all, he set to work with great skill and eloquence, so that those present seemed to be supporting his views. It was on this occasion that St Antony of Padua and Adam de Marisco[1] resisted him to his face with great strength; they

The latter dates from the end of the fourteenth century, while Glassberger was writing about 1508. But it contains many improbable statements, as well as manifest mistakes. There we learn that Brother Elias, discharged from his duties as Minister-general after his extraordinary apostrophe to St Antony, was succeeded by Albert of Pisa. Now, the latter did not succeed Brother Elias till 1239, eight years after the death of our Saint. We have therefore thought it right to give the preference to Glassberger's version, although we maintain great reserve with regard to him. The account given by this Brother Minor is not so incomplete; moreover Glassberger commits fewer mistakes than the compiler to whom we owe the "*Chronicle of the XXIV. Generals.*"

[1] Adam de Marisco, an Englishman, did not join the Franciscan Order till about the year 1230, and after that he spent some time at Oxford. It is thus scarcely likely that he would have been present at the Chapter of that year, the only one in which he could have joined with St Antony in raising a protest. *Cf. Analecta Franciscana*, vol. iii., p. 229, note 6. Moreover, the narrative given by Eccleston, who like Adam is also an Englishman, does not make the slightest allusion to him.

said that this was a perversion of the Rule, and of the evangelical life they had promised to follow, and that they would never consent to these innovations. Elias' partisans rose against these opposing Friars, declaring they were schismatics, and brought schism into the Order. St Antony and Adam then appealed to the Pontiff, to whom they went to take refuge, in spite of Elias' efforts, thanks to the protection of a Brother who was penitentiary and confessor to the Pope. The latter ordered all the Brothers who had taken part in the Chapter to appear before him. St Antony and Adam explained that the privileges in question would ruin the Rule and the evangelical life, and that it was only owing to the crafty insinuations of Elias that the Holy Father had been persuaded to grant them. They reminded him that St Francis had formally forbidden any demand for such privileges, and they added many reproaches which were openly levelled at Brother Elias. The latter, who until now had maintained a humble attitude, could no longer control his anger. Without any respect for the presence of the Pope he said to St Antony, "You lie, and your assertions are false." Gregory IX. was angered at this ill-timed interruption, and, turning to St Antony and his supporters, spoke thus to them, "Although Brother Elias may have excommunicated you, I absolve you since you appeal to the Canon; further, I congratulate you on your constancy, and on your zeal for the welfare of the Order." Then, addressing himself specially to St Antony, he added, "And as for you, Brother Antony, true Ark of the Covenant upon which rest the law

and the treasures of wisdom, I absolve you from all the obligations of the Order, and I hold you up as an example to the Brothers. I urge you only to apply yourself to prayer, and to the composition of sermons, and I invite you with the greatest good-will to dwell with me." But the Saint preferred the salvation of souls to the honours of the pontifical court, and having received the apostolic benediction, he retired to Monte Alverno. After having spent some time in this place, doing penance, and preaching—for the natural corpulence with which he was greatly inconvenienced prevented his working successfully—he went to Padua, where he died during the course of the year. A few days after, he was canonised by the Pope of whom we have just spoken.

A grave objection must be raised against this story and Thomas of Eccleston's narrative. Fra Salimbeue, who wrote a regular report against Brother Elias, entitled *Liber de Praelato*, does not even mention the name of our Saint. It is scarcely likely that he would have omitted to do so if he could have used so valuable an authority as St Antony against the man he was attacking. We admit that the argument *ex silentio* is not always absolutely conclusive. But Salimbeue entered the Order in 1238, and it would certainly be astonishing if details of such importance had not been related to him, if they were true.[1]

But above all it is Glassberger's narrative which is open to criticism. We must not forget

[1] *Cf.* Dr Lempp in the review already quoted, vol. xiii., p. 17.

that it dates from 1508, or not far off that year; that is to say, from a period considerably after the events described. Moreover, it presents more than one improbability. How could Elias have excommunicated St Antony when he had not the necessary jurisdiction to do so? And how could Jean Parenti, who after all was still Minister-general, have allowed the by no means scrupulous Franciscan to act thus? And how could the latter, always so prudent in his acts and so amiable in carrying out an object, lose his self-control in the presence of the Pope when it was to his own interest to make himself agreeable? How was it, when the majority was on Parenti's side, that there were only two Brothers who resisted Elias' plans, especially when we remember with what boldness courageous men such as Brother Egidius and Brother Bernard of Quintavalle defended the work of St Francis? We must also notice the inaccuracy of the end of the narrative: St Antony did not go to Alverno, and he was not canonised a few days after his death.

However, from among all these more or less veracious stories of which we have just spoken, the biographers have gathered the impression that our Saint was opposed to Elias, and that he also opposed every modification in the Rule laid down by the Founder. At this point we must make an essential and necessary distinction. St Antony was never a supporter of Elias, who, as we have stated earlier in this book, never hesitated as he ought to have done when it was a question of

carrying out a plan.[1] As to his attitude towards the changes introduced into the Rule, it is difficult to state anything with certainty. If it were proved that St Antony was Provincial of Emilia from 1227 to 1230, we might deduce from this fact some very definite conclusions. Indeed, in the definitive Rule of 1223, it is laid down that the Brothers are "to own nothing, neither house, nor land, nor anything, whatever it might be" (Act vi). Now on the 20th Oct. 1227, a bull granted to the Franciscans of Bassano, at their own request, possession of a church and all offices belonging to it, which they owed to the generosity of the bishop of the district. If St Antony was Provincial the request must have passed through his hands, and we may be permitted to conclude from this that he did not keep absolutely to the letter of the Rule. A similar argument might be based on the fact that he allowed the Brethren to accept the church of St Mary, which bishop Jacopo Corrado gave them within the city of Padua. But we ought to prove conclusively that the Saint did govern Emilia as Provincial, and we have stated earlier what we think of this statement formulated for the first time by Surius.[2] Again, following the example of

[1] Dr Lempp, *loc. cit.*, pp. 4-19, does not make this same distinction, but shows St Antony as being on Elias' side, as if the latter had never dreamed of any greater changes than the modifications introduced by the bull *Quo elongati*. But his discussion on the subject is instructive, as indeed everything is which this scholar has written.

[1] *Cf.* Dr Lempp, *loc. cit.*, p. 6. The bull of October 20th, 1227, is taken from Verci, *Storia degli Eccelini*, vol. iii., docum CX.,

Dr Lempp, we might here analyse the celebrated bull *Quo elongati* (Sept. 28th, 1230), in which Gregory IX. introduced modifications into the Franciscan Rule; and we might examine these to see if they were in accordance with St Antony's wishes.[1] The inquiry to which the German scholar has devoted his attention appears to us to have yielded no definite results, and we think that a new inquiry would be just as little fruitful.

But, judging by what we know of St Antony, we believe that he agreed without reservations of any kind to the interpretation which the Pope gave to the Franciscan Rule in the bull to which we have just referred. He was acquainted with Gregory IX., who had been from 1216 to 1227, that is until his accession to the Pontifical chair, the zealous and active protector of the Franciscans. Elected Pope at an advanced age, Gregory IX. was eighty-three years old when he put an end, at least for a time, to the discussions which troubled the peace of the Order. He quite understood the needs of the Franciscan Order, and old age, in adding to his experience, had in no wise decreased his clearness of thought nor his energy of decision. Would not St Antony naturally have greeted with joy the appearance of a bull which put an end to intestinal disagreement, and would he not have appreciated the wisdom and prudence which the Pope showed on this occasion?

Bassano, 1779. The German scholar discusses two other proofs establishing nothing, which we do not care to recapitulate here.

[1] Potthast, Nos. 8620 and 8627.

Some of the Brothers Minor adduced as evidence the *will* in which the Founder, a short time before his death, had forbidden all change in the Rule, and even all explanation of the terms in which it was written. But the Pope declared in his bull that these limitations laid down by St Francis were valueless, as he had not consulted the Provincials when he dictated them. St Antony was well aware that the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff was superior to that of the most venerated saint, even if this saint be called St Francis of Assisi. Moreover, he had received his first initiation into a religious life at the hands of the Regular Canons of St Augustine. He had only been attracted to the Franciscan Order by his longings for martyrdom, and if after having renounced these heroic projects he remained there, if indeed he had tutored himself into becoming an admirable monk, still he had never become a simple and *naïf* Brother Minor like Brother Egidius or Brother Bernard of Quintavalle. The knowledge he had acquired in the monasteries of Lisbon and Coimbra made such a transformation impossible. From his first initiation into the religious life, he had doubtless held the view that the Rule as laid down by St Francis was not an intangible treasure and the only type of perfection. He saw that owing to the needs of the age and the extraordinary growth of the Seraphic Family, it was useful to modify this Rule with regard to certain points. We must not forget that he himself was connected with an important innovation, since he was probably the first lecturer belonging to the Order.

Moreover, when we study, among the sermons which have come down to us attached to his name, those whose authenticity is least contested, we notice a great difference between his way of preaching and St Francis'. The latter was content to utter extempore the pious thoughts that came into his mind, and his apostolic success was due almost entirely to the holiness which breathed forth from his presence. In the other sermons to which we refer we meet almost in every sentence quotations from the Bible, comparisons taken from natural history, and a display of scientific knowledge somewhat astonishing in a Franciscan. There are many allegories, and so far-fetched that they could never have emanated from the mind of the *Poverello*.

We must not forget this important point also. St Francis never sought to convert the masses except by love. He did not attack sinners openly: he went about preaching gentleness, the goodness of God, the peace promised to men of good will. He also expressed his formal intention of never attacking the clergy, and of showing respect to prelates. St Antony did not, on the other hand, avoid discussions. He boldly attacked vice, and when occasion required it he reproached certain of the clergy for their attachment to worldly things. He reminds us in his sermons far more of St Bernard than of St Francis. We do not desire to criticise St Antony in any way, we simply state the fact to support our conclusions.

And our conclusions are these: Our Saint, judging by the facts which we gather from the most

reliable documents, was never opposed to any modifications introduced into the Rule, and certainly not to the one we discover in the bull *Quo elongati*. This was on his part wisdom, and not a tendency to laxity. We state this in opposition to some quite recent writers, who have studied the history of the *Dugento* very superficially. They show us in St Antony an absolutely immovable supporter of the Rule laid down by St Francis, and they are bold enough to prophesy that if he had lived, he would have upheld the separation of the Spirituals. This hypothesis is not merely based on false appearances, but when we examine it closely we see that it is absolutely contradicted by the whole life of the Saint.

CHAPTER VII

ST ANTONY'S WORK IN PADUA

WE have now come to the least obscure period in the life we are studying. The earliest biographer, who until now has taken so little trouble in giving details, lingers longer to tell us what the Saint did in Padua. He had, doubtless, at his disposal fuller documents, perhaps he had even been given information by persons who had been present at St Antony's preaching, and had been eye-witnesses of the events recorded. But in spite of all this, the biographer is far from completely satisfying our legitimate curiosity. He might have abandoned his wandering style of writing and his rhetorical outbursts, he might have related to us the facts in a clearer and more circumstantial manner; but he had not sufficient capacity to understand that his narrative should have brought out into strong relief the apostolic deeds of the Saint. On the contrary, he gives us a prolix and tedious account of the discussions which took place between the inhabitants of Padua and those living in the suburb of Capo di Ponte, relative to the place where St Antony was to be buried, That is indeed understanding history in an odd way. To complete the account which he

gives us of St Antony's sojourn at Padua we have, it is true, Rolandino, who wrote about 1260, whose evidence is of considerable value. But his object was to write the history of Padua and the March of Trevisia, and not the life of the Saint; when he does speak of him it is only by the way.[1] But indeed, after having so often to deplore the lack of reliable documents, we ought to consider ourselves fortunate in being able to give any details concerning the deeds of the Saint at Padua.

To estimate fairly his work in that town, it seems necessary to describe the political and moral condition in which it was when he came there. Placed in the March of Treviso, Padua possessed a commanding situation. Thanks to a fertile soil, and to an industry carried on with success by guilds of craftsmen, Padua was a wealthy town. As the town was reputed to be extremely prosperous, students eagerly hurried to its University founded in 1222, and the efforts made in 1228 to transfer this University to Vercelli were only partly successful. Padua was also powerful. During the time of the perpetual wars between the Guelphs and Ghibellines in upper Italy, everybody felt the necessity of alliance in order

[1] *Rolandini Patavini de Factis in Marchia Tarvisina Libri XII.*, in the Muratori collection, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. viii., Milan, 1526. His chronicle has been summarised by S. Salvagnini, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-147. But we recommend those who can do so to read this chronicle in the original text, which is full of life and interest. *Cf.* also in the same volume of the Muratori collection, *Monachi Patavini Chronicon*, p. 674, and *Mantissa adjecta*, p. 736, where there is only a brief reference to the Saint.

to be stronger in case of possible attacks. The less important towns allied themselves with the powerful cities. The nobles themselves built palaces in these formidable free towns with the object of becoming citizens. Thus the Camposampiero, the Contis, the Fontanas, the Forzates and other nobles had been incorporated with the Paduan aristocracy. The patriarch of Aquileia, Bertoldo, and the bishops of Feltre and Bellune, followed their example, and in return for certain conditions which were laid down obtained the rights of citizens of Padua. The government was a very strong one; it had at its head the Podestà, assisted by sixteen old men, a Grand Council and a lesser Council. The people had a share in the government without however being able to impose upon it their blind wishes and thoughtless caprices. We will add that Padua was Guelph in feeling at the time of which we are speaking.

Opposed to Padua stood Verona, its rival. Before 1227 Verona was divided in its allegiance between the Guelph party and the Ghibellines. In this year Salinguerra, who had succeeded in getting himself elected Podestà, allied himself with Ezzelino III. da Romano, who took Verona by surprise, and drove out the Guelph nobles, among others the Marquis d'Este and Count Rizzardo da Sanbonifacio. This Ezzelino is a strange figure to whom history has the name of "Ferocious." He was descended from a family which came from Germany, it appears, in the suite of the Emperor Conrad II. Ezzelino I., "the Stammerer," had been a citizen of Padua, and built the Palace of St Lucia; his son, Ezzelino II.,

"the Monk," had maintained friendly relations with the city before retiring into that mysterious solitude which gained him his nickname. As to Ezzelino III. he was a declared Ghibelline, and he imposed his policy on Verona when he gained possession of it.

Padua and Verona were not long before making war on each other in support of their respective allies. So at the instigation of Tiso da Camposampiero, whose grandson Guglielmo he had taken prisoner, whose fortress of Fonte he had seized, the people of Padua besieged Bassano where the assailant was: the latter gave up first the child, and then the castle.[1] The people of Trevisia at the instigation, and with the assistance of Ezzelino, seized the Archbishop of Bellune's property: Padua and the Guelphs, among whom were the Marquis d' Este and the Patriarch of Aquileia, marched out against them, and forced them to give back the stolen possessions. We do not wish to enter into any more details. We might see, if we chose, how the matrimonial alliances between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines did not put an end to wars or prevent deeds of violence. The picture we have in our minds of these times is one of a period of continual fighting, in which the laws relating to warfare were very brutal, and right could not triumph unless it was the stronger.[2]

Padua had to lament other evils besides that of war. Prosperity and riches had led to a highly

[1] Rolandino, *op. cit.*, bk. ii., ch. 8.

[2] See, in Salvagnini, pp. 131-142, in particular.

developed taste for luxury. When the people of Padua had not enough money to satisfy their passion for *fêtes*, they had recourse to money-lenders, who were paid exorbitant interest. The city was a prey to the scourge of usury. Nevertheless, although the life of the people in Padua was not exemplary in every respect, they had preserved a sincere faith which was about to be quickened by the preaching of St Antony.

Modern critics usually agree in thinking that St Antony did not come to Padua until 1229, basing their belief on a passage in Rolandino.[1] We do not wish to contradict their statement, as we do not possess sufficient facts to refute it. If this could be proved, it would show that the Saint could not have lived in Padua for two years; for there was certainly at least one interruption to his sojourn in this town. In any case he exercised enormous influence there, traces of which are to be found in the documents of the thirteenth century.

The Chronicler Rolandino informs us that unaccustomed peace reigned in the March of Treviso at the end of the year 1229, and the beginning of the following year. Good things of all kinds abounded. Joy and gaiety appeared throughout the district, and many believed that wars and seditions had passed

[1] Rolandino, *op. cit.*, book ii., ch. 19, p. 198. "Nam et in illo tempore, inter caeteros viros religiosos et justos, advenit Beatus Antonius." Does the author mean to indicate that St Antony arrived at Padua for the first time? This is what we would not venture to assert. See, however, the pamphlet of L. Palatini, *Prima venuta di S. Antonio a Padova.* Venice, 1894. This author has not the same hesitation as we have.

away for ever. Moreover, religious men added to the happiness of the multitude by preaching to them the sacred text, and almost all the people gave themselves up to wholesome thoughts. "Amongst these religious and just men came the blessed St Antony, who, in various parts of the March, preached the divine word with an eloquence as sweet as honey." In another passage in his chronicle Rolandino likewise tells us, "At this time (1230) God sent to Padua from the extreme limits of Hesperia and the West, that is to say, from Galicia, Seville and Lisbon, the religious and holy man of whom we have spoken, Brother Antony of the Order of Brothers Minor, the offspring of a noble and powerful family; celebrated for his virtues and his acquaintance with letters, he was the Ark of the Old Testament, the very type of the New, and if I may use the phrase, powerful in words and in deeds. His body dwelt with his brother monks at Padua, but his soul will live in heaven. In his frequent preachings in the villages and towns in the district round Padua and all the March, he constantly lifted his eyes and still more his soul towards heaven." [1]

We have no details concerning the work of the Saint at Padua in the year 1229. Besides his preaching, of which Rolandino speaks, probably he occupied himself in writing out either wholly or

[1] Rolandino, *loc. cit.*, and book iii., ch. v., pp. 202, 203. We need not be astonished at the somewhat vague way the author designates the country whence St Antony came. To the Italians of that period Portugal formed part of Spain. Coimbra is not far from Galicia, and Seville is not a long way off Lisbon.

in part his *Sermones Dominicales*. In any case this work had been accomplished at Padua before May 25th, 1230. We have already spoken of the Chapter-general which was held at this time, on which occasion the relics of St Francis were carried away. We added that St Antony was then freed from all duties appertaining to the Franciscan Order, and authorised by the Minister-general to preach wherever he liked.

The first use that he made of his liberty was to return to Padua, the inhabitants having retained their hold on his affections on account of their sincere faith, and the wonderful zeal he had observed in them.[1] During the following winter (1230-1231), at the request of the Cardinal of Ostia, Rinaldo dei Conti, the patron of the Franciscan Order,[2] he set himself to write out his *Sermones in Festivitatibus Sanctorum*. But when Lent came he put this occupation on one side so as to devote himself entirely to the evangelisation of the people. He spoke daily throughout the forty Holy Days. He was ill and oppressed by his excessive corpulence, but he paid no attention to that, and became so entirely absorbed in the work of preaching and confessing that very often he remained fasting till sunset.

His zeal was rewarded by the enthusiasm of his listeners, who came, not only from Padua, but also from the towns, market-places and castles of the

[1] Here we have only translated briefly the early legend, with which the *Vita Auctore Anonymo*, published by the Bollandists, *loc. cit.*, p. 204, and the text of Father Josa, p. 92, agree.

[2] Later, Pope, under the name of Alexander IV.

surrounding district. He had at first intended to preach in each of the churches in succession. But soon none of them were large enough to contain the crowds, and he was obliged to go into large fields, spacious enough for everyone to be admitted. He had often, if one can believe a report related by the early biographer, as many as thirty thousand for his audience. Shopkeepers closed their shops in order to hear him, and did not re-open them till the preaching was over. People got up in the middle of the night to get a good place, and arrived with the dawn at the place where St Antony was to preach. Knights and noble ladies, accustomed to get up late, and to pass a considerable portion of their time in bed, actually came before sunrise. These listeners of all ranks and both sexes cast on one side their luxurious garments, and adopted a severe, and even monastic, garb. The Bishop of Padua, Jacopo Corrado, listened most piously, in company with his clergy, to the preaching of the Saint.

When St Antony began to preach, all talk and whispering ceased immediately, and the audience, forgetting everything, gave itself up, body and soul, to the power of the preacher. When he had finished, he escaped as best he could, or waited till the crowd had dispersed. Often, to escape from those who rushed up to him, he had to be protected by a large escort of brave men. The women, especially, made themselves noticeable by their indiscreet enthusiasm: they brought scissors and cut off fragments from his garments, which they preserved as sacred relics.

The result of his preaching was excellent everywhere. His words restored peace among those who had been at enmity; they caused the captive to be set free, and the restitution of that which had been seized owing to violence or usury. People even went so far as to mortgage their houses and lands to procure money, then they cast it at his feet in order to make the restitution which he advised. At the sound of his voice courtesans abandoned their immoral life; and robbers, famous for their crimes, henceforth respected the property of others.

We give, in connection with this, an anecdote which has been preserved by Jean Rigaud.[1] About 1292 an old man, meeting a Brother Minor, told him that he had known St Antony. "I belonged," said he, "to a band of twelve brigands who lived in the woods, and pillaged, and robbed all travellers. Having heard the Saint's preaching much praised, we agreed to go disguised to listen to him. We did not believe that his words would be so efficacious, and that, like the flaming torch of a new Elias, he would illumine everything. We came, as I say, to hear him preach; we had no need to listen for long to his impassioned discourse before feeling great remorse for our crimes. After the sermon we went to confess to him. The holy Father heard us in turn, gave each a wholesome penance, and forbade us ever to return to our past crimes; he promised those who abstained from them the joys of eternal life, and predicted for those who fell back into crime great

[1] "*La vie de saint Antoine de Padoue*," pp. 100-102. *Cf. Liber Miraculorum* in the *Anal. Franc.*, vol. iii., p. 151.

torment. Some went back to their criminal life, and ended their days as the Saint had prophesied; those who abstained from it died at peace with their Saviour. As for me, the Saint imposed upon me as my penance the duty of making twelve visits to the tomb of the apostles, and now I have just finished my twelfth pilgrimage." The old man told his story with tears as he walked along by the side of the Brother Minor; he wished to see the fulfilment of the Saint's promise, and after a miserable life to enjoy eternal happiness.

So great was the number of penitents who wished to confess their sins that it was not possible to attend them all, even though various Brothers and many secular priests attending on St Antony were sent for. Among these penitents several asserted that they had been warned by a heavenly vision, and directed to the Saint with the command to obey his advice in everything. Others, after his death, secretly informed the Brothers Minor that he had appeared to them in their sleep, telling them to which of the Brothers they were to go.[1]

How are we to explain the extraordinary success obtained by St Antony through his preaching? First of all there is no doubt it was due to the reputation for holiness which the sacred orator enjoyed, and to the popularity of the Brothers Minor. We willingly allow that there was among the crowds that thronged round him an enthusiasm such as is so often produced by an extraordinary personality. Still it must be admitted

[1] *Portug. Monum. historica*, p. 119.

that the merit of his sermons assisted largely in the marvellous effect which they produced. They must have aroused in the minds of his audience a peculiar interest, which unfortunately cannot be accounted for in these days. Nevertheless, this is a sufficiently important question for us to spend a little time in examining it. What idea ought we to have concerning these sermons?

Without being able to assert anything definite with regard to the language used by the Saint when preaching, we are strongly inclined to believe that he preached in the vulgar tongue. We agree with M. Lecoy de la Marche, and the great majority of writers who have studied the question of preaching in the Middle Ages,[1] that the religious orators when addressing the people usually spoke in the dialect of the district in which they were living. If this were not the case we cannot account for the enthusiasm of the masses for sermons which they could not have understood. Certainly it was

[1] We possess an excellent work on the preaching of the Middle Ages: *La chaire française au moyen âge, spécialement au XIII^e siècle*, par A. Lecoy de la Marche, Paris, 1868. Nothing that has been written since has been able to shake the conclusions so justly brought forward by the author, which are almost generally admitted. However, our readers, if they like, may consult B. Hauréau. *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques*, vol. xxii. and xxiii., and *Notices et Extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, 1890-1892. In *Histoire de la langue et de la Littérature française*, edited by M. Petit de Julleville, vol. ii., Paris, 1896; M. Arthur Piaget has dealt with the subject without, in our humble opinion, in any way affording us further information.

true with regard to France. As far as Italy is concerned we might perhaps have reason to doubt it: was the vulgar tongue of the people of Padua in the thirteenth century so different from Latin that the latter could not have been understood by everybody? But, after all, and although St Antony's sermons were more learned than those of St Francis of Assisi, we are disinclined to believe that the disciple would have abandoned the traditions of his master, and would not have preached to them in the vulgar tongue. We know that two centuries later St Bernardine of Siena preached in Italian although he wrote his sermons in Latin. A cloth-shearer, Benedetto, who heard these sermons, took the trouble to write them out in their original form. But we cannot form any conclusions concerning one period from another period, especially when we remember that the evolution of the Italian language had emphasised in the fifteenth century its divergence from Latin, and that the latter had become less accessible to the masses. It is much to be regretted that a Benedetto could not be found to take down and transmit to us the discourses of St Antony exactly as he delivered them.[1]

The Saint wrote out his sermons: we have on this matter the formal evidence of the earliest biographer, who, when mentioning the *Sermones de Tempore*, and the *Sermons for the Saints' Days*, indicates the period when they were respectively

[1] *Cf. Un prédicateur populaire dans l'Italie de la Renaissance, Saint Bernardin de Sienne*, by Paul Thureau-Dangin of the French Academy, pp. 156-212. Paris, 1896.

written. Several scholars, among others J. de la Haye, have even claimed to give us the text of these hortatory fragments which were all written in Latin.[1] Those of them which can be attributed to him, because they were the work of his pen, or were at least inspired by him, are not the exact translation of those he gave to the public. This was quite usual in the Middle Ages. We find, under the name of an author, Latin sermons which do not correspond with the sermons written in French or Italian. That is because the former were written, not to be delivered, as the latter were, but to assist in the training of less practised orators, or to remind the author of points with which it was well to deal: they were thus either models or aids to memory. The fact that the Saint was invited by the Cardinal of Ostia to compose his *Sermons for Saints' Days* seems to show that St Antony wrote them out for the benefit of others. He had moreover a prodigious memory, which enabled him to preach without the aid of notes or expositions prepared beforehand.

However, it is quite sufficient to examine the sermons which appear most authentic to establish the fact that they were not delivered as they have come down to us: they would not have been under-

[1] Concerning the authenticity of different collections of sermons attributed to St Antony of Padua, we beg our readers to consult Appendix II. of our book. We are indebted, for our study, to two publications of Father Josa, *Sermones sancti Antonii de Padua in laudem Gloriosae Virginis Mariae*, Patavii, 1885. We have not been able to get Pagi, and we have not ventured to use D. Locatelli's publication for the purpose of quotation.

stood by the people, even in the vulgar tongue they would simply have produced astonishment, fatigue, and finally disgust. Ideas are crowded together, texts from the Bible abound, there are comparisons in profusion, very often without any apparent logical connection. As soon as the Saint has just touched upon a subject, and we are in hopes he is going to work it out, he leaves it to deal with another point. This usual characteristic of his sermons is easily accounted for if we accept the view that he wished to give a sketch, rather than an actual essay: otherwise they appear strange and incomprehensible.

Nevertheless these sketches, such as we possess, can give us some idea of the way in which St Antony regarded preaching, and the means he employed to attract the attention of crowds.

The foundation of all his teaching was the Bible, a fact which ought in no wise to astonish us. But what does surprise us is the interpretation he gives to the inspired text: he does not seek for the ordinary and natural meaning of it, but he sees in it an allegory which he explains in such a way as to arrive at moral conclusions. It is true that he often gives several sermons on the same subject, distinguishing the allegorical sermons from the moral sermons, but when we examine them all it is often very difficult to see the points wherein they differ. The quotations from the Bible are everywhere so numerous, and they occur so naturally, that they prove an immense knowledge of both the Old and the New Testament. They certainly justify the name

given to St Antony by Pope Gregory IX. The use of a concordance, even if he had by chance possessed one, would not explain the facility with which the inspired writings came into the Saint's mind.

He quotes also sometimes passages from the Fathers of the Church, though only rarely. Those he seems to prefer are St Augustine, St Jerome, and above all St Gregory and St Bernard: still he does not seem to have studied any one of them thoroughly or with special care. In default of these authorised interpreters of the Bible he has recourse to etymology to which he constantly refers, so that at length it becomes wearisome. He cannot mention a proper name in the Bible without giving its meaning—sometimes he even finds several meanings—in order to see an allegory in it. Thus, according to him, the name Thamar means "changed," "bitter," or a "palm-tree": this woman is therefore typical of the soul which changes from evil to good, which tastes the bitterness of penitence so that later it may become a palm of glory. Sion means "rock," likewise "observation": this town typifies the soul which is in the body like a rock among the waves, dashed against by the billows of temptation: that is why it must watch carefully both within and without.[1] These derivations sometimes agree with those of St Isidor of Seville, and we may suppose that our Saint took them from him. But he used other books as well, among which the *Liber Derivationum* of Hugutio of Pisa will serve as an example.[2]

[1] *Cf.* Josa, *Sermones in Solemnitatibus*, pp. 139 and 142.

[2] Hugutio Pisanus (*episcopus Ferrariensis*), *Liber Derivationum.*

Finally he invented derivations for himself; he heaps up his derivations with the ease of a man who has no difficulty in finding them.

The French preachers of the Middle Ages liked to borrow anecdotes from profane history, and more often still from the fables which were so popular with us at this time. We cannot find traces of any such in the sermons of St Antony. He interested his audiences by comparisons drawn from the three realms of nature. Sometimes these comparisons are based on derivations which would astonish us if we did not know what our forefathers understood by the science of etymology.[1] But more often he had recourse to ideas taken from natural history,

Codex chart. s. xv Bibl. Gottingensis, vol. ii., quoted by Prof. D. Reichling in his edition of the *Doctrinale des Alexander de Villa-Dei.* Berlin, 1893.

[1] We will point out, at random, some of these derivations. "Pelles a pellendo, id est, detrahendo, dictae. . . . Vultus dictus, quod per eum animi voluntas ostenditur. . . . Thus a tondendo est dictum. (The Saint adds: Unde a quibusdam sine aspiratrice scribitur.) A little further on: Thus, a theos dictum. . . . Vimen dictum, quod vim multam habeat viroris. . . . Vitis, dicta quod vim habeat radicandi, vel quod invicem se innectit. (*Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, pp. 33, 35, 37, 41, 55.) In the collection of *Sermones . . . in Solemnitatibus* we notice: 'Mundus dictus, quia semper est in motu. . . . Arrhabo dicitur arrha bona; arrha dicta a re pro qua datur. . . . Pulvis dictus quod pulsetur vi venti. . . . Vox dicta, quod voluntatem animi annunciet.'" (Pp. 130, 139, 140, 147, 159). We must not be too much astonished at these explanations: we find no less surprising ones given by the greatest scholars of the Middle Ages. Did not St Thomas Aquinas derive the word "lapis" from "laedere pedem." Moreover there are even in these days men of a certain amount of intellectual culture who will allow such derivations as this: cadaver = caro data vermibus.

such as were to be found at that time in the fable-books about animals, in the lapidaries, and the encyclopædias of a similar kind. As the most extraordinary things usually pleased best, the authors of these compilations did not take much care in discriminating between the true and the false. The Saint, who took his information more than once from these books—*in naturalibus*, to use his own expression, reproduces the mistakes which were current in those days.

Here, for example, is an explanation of the fall of leaves, which will astonish modern naturalists. "Warmth," St Antony tells us, "is the food and nourishment of all that has life, and when it disappears, ruin and death are the result. For death is the extinction of natural warmth in the heart, owing to lack of humidity and the approach of its opposite. That is why we notice that the fall of the leaves is caused by the absence of nourishment, that is to say, the absence of warmth. Indeed, when in winter cold seizes upon the outside of trees and plants, heat flees to the other extreme and takes refuge in the roots. When it is all concentrated there, it entirely attracts to it the sap of the upper branches and of the extremities of the boughs: thus the heat is tempered, and if it were not so, the lower branches would be burnt. As the upper portion of the tree loses its nourishment, the leaves of necessity fall." This explanation of vegetable physiology is then applied to the soul, which loses all its attributes when it is bereft of the ardour given by the Holy Spirit.[1]

[1] *Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, p. 22.

But the comparisons instituted by the Saint generally rest on careful observation, of which we will give a few examples. In reference to a passage in Isaiah (lx. 31), in which it is said that the fir-tree, the box and the pine, shall ornament the place sanctified by God, that is to say, his temple, he explains who the faithful are who honour the Virgin Mary. "The fir-tree, so called because it grows higher than other trees (*dicta quod prae caeteris eat*) is the type of those who contemplate celestial objects. The box, which does not grow in height, and bears no fruit, but always remains green, indicates those Christians who keep their faith constantly fresh. The pine is a species of tree so called because of the needles to its leaves (*pinum enim antiqui dicebant acutum*), and it is the emblem of the penitents who are conscious of their sins, and pierce their hearts with the needle of their penitence in order to weep tears of blood. All those, that is to say the faithful ones who are contemplative, and those who are penitent, come to this solemn feast (of the Assumption) to honour, by their devotion, their praise, and their eulogies, the Blessed Virgin Mary, who is the temple of Jesus Christ, in whom He sanctified His humanity." [1]

Elsewhere the Saint speaks to us of the rainbow, in which he sees four colours only, and he tells us that the Sun of justice by becoming incarnate by the Virgin Mary made her a magnificent arch as a sign of peace and reconciliation between God and men. The dark colour in the rainbow reminds

[1] *Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, p. 50.

us of the Virgin's poverty; the blue, of her humility; the gold, of her charity; and the flame colour, of her incorruptible virginity. "For," he tells us, "flame cannot be injured or damaged by iron." [1]

In the sermon on the Assumption of which we have already given a fragment, he takes as his text the following passage from Ecclesiastes (i. 10), *Quasi vas auri solidum ornatum omni lapide pretioso, quasi oliva pullulans et cypressus in altum se extollens.* He there seizes the opportunity for comparing the Holy Virgin to a vase, an olive, and a cypress.

She is a vase, because her humility has prepared her to receive the infusion of grace: pride repulses all that one would like to give it. She is like a golden vase on account of her poverty; for this virtue makes those who possess it rich and magnificent. We must say, *en passant*, that this reflection reveals in our Saint the spirit of the Seraphic Patriarch. Mary is a solid vase because she is a virgin; otherwise she would be a broken vase, which could not contain wisdom. Finally, like a vase ornamented with all kinds of precious stones, she receives indescribable gifts on the day of her Assumption.

Passing to the second comparison suggested by the text, St Antony compares the Virgin Mary to an olive. He was wrong as to the meaning of the Latin word, which signifies both an "olive" and an "olive-tree," but the adjective which qualifies the noun might have shown him that the reference here is to a tree. But let us hear

[1] In the same collection of sermons, p. 32.

his explanation: "The olive-tree is a plant, the olive is a fruit, and the oil is the juice. The olive-tree gives us first of all a sweet-smelling flower, which later becomes an olive which is at first green, then red, after which it reaches maturity. The blessed Anne was like the olive-tree which produced this white flower, with a perfume not to be described, that is to say the Holy Mary, and the latter was 'green' because of the conception and birth of the Son of God. The word 'green' is applied to a virgin. (*Viridis eo quod vim retineat.*) In the conception and birth of the Saviour the Blessed Virgin preserved her virginity, and so retained her virtue. She remained a virgin both before and after the birth of her Son. She partook of the nature of purple during the passion of her Son, which pierced her very soul. Finally she reached her maturity at her Assumption, which we celebrate to-day: for she has obtained both the power and the joy in the glory of the heavenly beatitude. . . ."

As to the comparison with the cypress it is scarcely touched upon in the Latin version. He simply says that on this day, just as the cypress rises above the other trees, Mary is elevated in glory above all the angels.

In this brief analysis we have been obliged to neglect the chance thoughts which St Antony gathered in the course of his sermon. In the Latin summary, for example, we find long digressions in which Mary is compared to the temple of God; further on the author makes of her a new Esther, and explains to us in detail how she is

received into heaven, typified by the palace of Ashasuerus; and towards the end he finds a new comparison for her in the throne of which the prophet Ezekiel speaks, and on which the Saviour is seated. It is sufficient to read this sermon to see that it could not have been preached in the form in which it is given here. The ideas which are crowded together are so numerous, and often so incongruous, that the Saint could only have used some of them; from this sermon alone it was easy to make several.[1]

But no passage perhaps could show more clearly than the following what a crowd of thoughts thronged in upon the Saint's mind, and how well he used his knowledge of natural history for the purpose of deducing moral lessons. He gives the turtle-dove and the dove as models to penitents. "See how, if the turtle-dove loses her mate, she never takes another. She goes about alone, no longer drinks the clear water nor perches on a green bough. In the same way the dove in her simplicity has a nest which is less carefully attended to, and smaller than that of other birds. She hurts no one with her beak or her claws; she does not live on plunder; she feeds her little ones with anything she can get; she does not feed on flesh, but on grain, which she picks up; she does not fight with other birds, even the smallest ones, and she warms the nests of others as well as her own. She lives on the waters to protect herself from the sparrow-hawk; she makes her nest in the rock,

[1] *Ibidem*, pp. 49-57.

and takes refuge in this nest when the bad weather sets in. She defends herself with her wings, flies in company with other turtle-doves, and for a song has only cooing. She has many young ones whom she nourishes two by two. Notice likewise that when the dove has young ones that are growing up the male-bird picks up salt from the ground and puts it in their beaks to accustom them to food. And if the female bird is slow in returning to them[1] . . . the male bird strikes her and forces her to go back to the nest." St Antony then applies all these characteristics to the soul of the Christian. The thoughts are only indicated, and are sometimes rather vague on account of brevity. But we can quite understand that these thoughts, amplified and breathed upon by the honey-like eloquence which Rolandino attributes to St Antony, would have made a very great impression on crowds. The common people have a singular liking for metaphors and similes which they can understand, because their minds are less open to reason and reflexion than to feeling and imagination.[2]

[1] The Latin text here gives one detail very difficult to explain: "Propter dolorem partus." The explanation which seems to us the most natural is this: On account of the pain she suffered in hatching. The Latin of these sermons is obscure and often decidedly difficult to translate into intelligible and correct English.

[2] The Saint himself tells us, in the prologue to his *Sermones de Tempore*, that in his preaching he desired to appeal to the taste of his listeners: "Ad hoc nostri temporis lectorum et auditorum devenit insipida sapientia, quod nisi verba exquisita et novum quid resonantia invenerit vel audierit, legere fastidit, audire contemnit. Et ideo ne verbum Dei in animarum suarum periculum eis veniret in contemptum et fastidium . . . quasdam rerum et

We cannot resist the desire to quote two fragments taken from one of St Antony's Christmas sermons: they show the lively imagination of the Saint when he came to speak of Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary. "Spring," he says, "was so called because it is green. (*Ver dictum quod viret.*) Then the earth is clothed with many plants, and begemmed with flowers; the air is mild, the birds modulate their song, and all seems to smile on us. We render thanks to thee, oh Holy Father, that in the midst of winter and cold thou hast prepared the springtime for us. Truly in the birth of Thy Beloved Son Jesus, which we celebrate in the depth of winter, Thou hast given us a spring-like and beautiful season. To-day the Virgin—ground sanctified by the blessings of God—has given birth to a flourishing plant, the support of penitents, that is, the Son of God. To-day the earth is decked with roses and lilies of the valley. To-day the Angels sing with sweet voices, 'Glory to God in the Highest.' To-day the tranquillity which peace gives is restored to the earth. What more shall I say to you? All rejoice, all is smiling. That is why the Angels said to the Shepherds on this day, 'Behold I bring you great joy. . . .'"

In the same sermon he applies to the Virgin Mary the text from Ecclesiastes (l. 8), *Quasi lilia quae sunt*

animalium naturas et nominum etymologias moraliter expositas ipsi operi inseruimus. . . ." We take this extract from the preface which Father Josa has placed at the beginning of his edition of the *Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, p. 11. This prologue is reproduced in its entirety by D. Locatelli in his edition of the *Sermones Dominicales et in Solemnitatibus*, pp. 3-5.

in transitu aquae. The Virgin is like a lily on the bank of a stream, and he explains this by the most delightful similes. "The lily," he tells us, "springs from uncultivated ground; it grows in the valleys; it is white and sweet-smelling, but when the leaves close it hides its perfume, and does not breathe it forth again till they open. It has six petals, golden stamens, and a pistil in the centre. Lastly, it is able to heal limbs that have been burnt. The lily, so called because it is like milk—*lilium dictum, quasi lacteum*—is the image of the Blessed Virgin, absolutely pure, thanks to the glory of her virginity, and born of honest and lowly parents: Joachim, whose name signifies 'one who rises,' and Anna, whose name is synonymous with 'grace.' To-day, just as the lily gives forth its perfume, the Virgin has brought forth the Son of God. She has six branches. (Here St Antony, in working out this idea, refers to a sermon he preached on the Fifth Sunday after Pentecost.) The golden stamens are the poverty and humility with which the virginity of Mary was adorned. The pistil is the Glory of the Divine Love in the heart of the Blessed Virgin. She cures sinners who are consumed by the passion of their vices. . . ." The Saint then shows how the soul of sinners is attacked by diabolical temptations, and how it becomes blackened because consent to sin is like smoke which covers it in darkness. (We will not quote this passage literally because it is difficult to translate, and is opposed to what has gone before.) The Blessed Virgin causes this darkness and fire to disappear through the health-giving purity of her

holiness. We can therefore explain the text thus: *Quasi lilia in transitu aquae.* Just as the lilies by the water's side preserve their freshness, their beauty, and their perfume, so the Blessed Mary, when she had given birth to her son, preserved the freshness and beauty of her virginity.

The sermon then closes with this short peroration: "This is then the prayer which we address to thee, Our Lady, the Holy Mother of God, on this day when thy Son was born, who was conceived by thee, a Virgin, and whom thou hast wrapped in swaddling clothes and rocked in a cradle. Intercede on our behalf, and extinguish the flame which the fiery passion of vice has lit up in our soul by thy divine compassion, so that we may finally attain to the joy of the heavenly life. May we be granted this grace by Him who deigned to be born of the Virgin. To Him be all honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen."[1]

In the Latin version of the sermons oratorical expressions are rare, and always very briefly indicated. That is easily understood. St Antony only wished to give outlines, and ideas which were to be worked out: it would be quite easy for the preachers to find thoughts and feelings which would spring forth naturally from these ideas. If there are any portions of a sermon which can be improvised without much difficulty they are the

[1] Father Josa, *Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, pp. 31-35. The text of the peroration has these words: "Tuae misericordiae emplastro sanes." The expression was considered a noble one in the Middle Ages: but words, even they, have their fate.

oratorical outbursts which produce far more effect when they are natural and spontaneous.

As to the feeling that animated the Saint's preaching,—it is difficult to give a satisfactory idea of it, especially nowadays when we have no longer the complete text of the sermons which are considered the most authentic. The allegorical and mystical explanations which are to be found in his published works, although they show a rich imagination, can scarcely give us any general idea of the feelings that must have animated the Saint throughout his life.

The sermons on the Blessed Virgin are however an exception to this. We notice, in examining and summarising these, that St Antony is not content with mere pleasant similes; he gives us a real Marian scheme of theology. Nevertheless, he only repeats the ideas of the preachers and theologians of his age, St Bernard particularly. If, however, he is more picturesque in his style than the last of the Fathers of the Church, he is certainly inferior to him in strength of thought. Like him, indeed, he recounts with delight the prerogatives granted to Mary, which made her a creature privileged above all others, her power of intercession, her kindness to all Christians, and finally her most important part in the scheme of the Redemption.

We must not pass over in silence the following point. In his celebrated treatise, *De Locis Theologicis*, Melchior Cano quotes a passage from a sermon by St Antony on the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, and concludes from it that he did

not believe in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. We answer this in the following way. In another place St Antony asserts his belief in this dogma perfectly clearly. As to the passage which struck the above-mentioned theologian, it can be explained without difficulty, if we remember that St Antony's sermons were not written out in scholarly Latin, and that, to him, the word "sanctification" had a less precise meaning than it had to the illustrious Preaching Brother.[1]

If we wish to form any idea of the way in which

[1] Here is our Saint's Latin text: "Sed gloriosa Virgo nec in sua Nativitate habuit maculam, quia in utero matris fuit sanctificata. . . ." But, in a sermon for the third Sunday in Lent, we find this other passage: "Beatus ergo venter gloriosae Virginis, de qua dicit beatus Augustinus in libro de Natura et gratia: Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quaestionem. . . . Hac Virgine excepta, si omnes sancti et sanctae congregari possent, et quaereretur ab eis an peccatum haberent, quid responderent, nisi quod ait Joannes: Si dixerimus quod peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est? Illa autem gloriosa Virgo singulari gratia praeventa est atque repleta. . . ."

The two extracts are to be found in Father Josa, *Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, p. 17, note. The second is also given in D. Locatelli's work, p. 89. Here, it is a question of a peculiar prerogative which places the Holy Virgin above all creatures: but, if Mary had been made holy after having committed original sin, she would be in the same category as Jeremiah and St John the Baptist. But let us note St Augustine's assertion, quoted by Antony. And finally, we must not forget (from the same collection, p. 50) the following passage: "(Beata Maria) fuit locus sanctificationis Jesu Christi, in qua ipse se sanctificavit." Clearly the Saint does not here use the term "sanctify" in the sense of "deliver from sin."

the Saint regarded morality, we must notice that he separates believers into two classes: the penitent and the contemplative. The first are those believers who live in the world, and desire to serve God. The second are those who have given up earthly possessions: they include men belonging to all the religious orders, and those Christians who have renounced for ever the things of the world. He constantly refers to this distinction which he made between the two classes, and he praises highly the contemplative life. But he will not allow that worldly persons can be contented without penitence, nor that they can really remain attached to temporal things. He strongly insists upon this point, and on reading certain passages in his sermons we can quite understand what the chronicler tells us concerning the behaviour of the audience, who listened to the Saint's sermons during Lent 1231.

He bids all to cast out three vices—pride, love of pleasure, desire for money. If he refuses to excuse these sins in the laity, he is particularly severe in his condemnation of them among the secular clergy. In a sermon in honour of the Apostles St Peter and St Paul, he says that the priest who neglects his flock is an idol in the Church, like Dagon near the Ark of the Lord. "Yes," he continues, "he is an idol, because he has eyes for the vain things of the world, and not for the misery of the poor; he has ears to hear the flattery of his servants, and not the lamentations of the indigent; he has nostrils for smelling, as a woman

would, all that ministers to his sense of smell, but not for smelling the perfume of paradise and the stench of hell; he has hands for heaping up riches, but not for soothing the scars which remain from Christ's wounds. He has feet which he employs in going forth to fortify his castles, and to demand his tribute, and not in preaching the Word of God; the praise of God is not on his lips. What is there in common between the Church of Christ and this rotten image? And, what, as the Apostle said (2 Cor. vi. 15.) can there be in common between wheat and chaff, Christ and Belial? The arm of this idol shall be withered by a divine decree, so that it shall no longer be able to do anything."[1] Were we not right in noticing the great difference between St Francis of Assisi and St Antony, and his likeness to St Bernard?

As to heretics, he only attacked them incidentally, generally by means of a telling anecdote, without staying to refute them. There is nothing astonishing in this.[2] Controversy had not yet produced the treatises against the Albigenses, Cathari, Patarini,

[1] *Sermones . . . in solemnitatibus*, edited by Father Josa, p. 166. *Cf. Sermones . . . in laudem G. V. Mariae*, by the same editor, p. 33.

[2] C. Schmidt, in his *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares*, vol. ii., p. 238, makes the following remark: "Not one of the Schoolmen offered his dialectic, on behalf of the system of the Church, to confute this heresy. They do not seem to have even noticed heresy; they despised it, possibly they were disdainful of it. . . ." This statement is exaggerated. What is true is that controversy with heretics was not regarded in the same light as it is to-day, and was left to the personal impulse of individuals.

or the other sects that supported Manicheism. The work (of refutation) was extremely difficult, as their errors were based on principles quite different from those of the Catholic doctrine. Moreover, St Antony doubtless wrote out his two collections of sermons for the use of the clergy who were preaching to believers: he had therefore only to remind them of ideas which might help these, and of explanations which he thought would be the most useful for this purpose.

As we have spoken of St Antony's preaching we will now try to find other traces in Padua of his apostolic work. We said that he frequently preached against usury, and we must revert to this subject for a moment. At the present time, when money is so abundant, it is difficult for us to understand the havoc wrought by this scourge during the Middle Ages. This illicit trade was not only carried on by the Jews; everywhere, and perhaps in Italy more than elsewhere, Christians resorted to it as a prompt and easy means of getting rich.[1] So far as Padua

[1] To obtain a correct idea of the conditions which prevailed in usury in Italy at this time, it is well to read the important studies of the learned Prof. A. Gloria, *Le Origini dell' Università di Padova*, and *la Pietra del vituperii nel Salone di Padova*, Padova, 1851. There is still to be seen in the *Salone* at Padua a stone with this inscription: *Lapis vituperii et cessionis bonorum.* The insolvent debtor used to come clad only in shirt and hose. Before one hundred witnesses he sat down three times on the stone and pronounced the formula, *Cedo bonis*, and from that time he was free from any kind of suit. The statute of 1261, which regulated this procedure, was much later than Antony's death. But it had certainly a precedent in the statute of 1231, instigated by the Saint.

is concerned we learn that in 1228 interest on money varied from 20% to 30%. The Town, wishing to keep its students, and prevent its University from being transferred to Vercelli, established for their benefit a kind of bank, which lent out money at a more moderate interest, about 20%. It appears that having promised to lend them money at 5% to the extent of £100,000, it could not fulfil its engagements. That is not all. Unfortunate debtors who were once insolvent were not only stripped of their property; they could also be condemned to banishment, or kept in gaol until they had paid the whole of their debt.

We do not know of all the efforts made by St Antony on behalf of those unfortunate creatures. Barthélemy of Trent, his contemporary, tells us that he caused many of the inhabitants of Padua to make rightful restitution. But we still possess the text of an old statute drawn up March 15th, 1231, during the government of Stephano Badoer, at the request of the Saint. This is stated with absolute clearness. In future no one could be kept in prison, for any debt whatsoever, after he had yielded his property to his creditors or guarantors. This was one step towards the more merciful measures which were introduced later on.[1]

[1] The work of Bartholomew of Trent is lost, and we only know of his evidence through the *Acta SS*, the vol. already mentioned, p. 196. *Cf.* also the primitive legend, p. 119, of the *Port. Mon. hist.* The text of the statute is given by Prof. A. Gloria, in his work entitled *Donatello Fiorentino e le sue opere mirabili nel tempio di St. Antonio in Padova*, p. 3 of the *Documenti*, Padua, 1895.

St Antony also often intervened for the release of prisoners, and once he made a demand of this kind of Ezzelino III. da Romano. This is what the chronicler Rolandino tells us concerning this matter. Ezzelino, in alliance with the Ghibellines of Verona, had succeeded in driving out the Guelphs from that town, and several of the latter were taken prisoners. Among those was Rizzardo, Count of Sanbonifacio, and brother-in-law of Ezzelino. The Podestà, Stefano Badoer, at the head of the Paduans, made an expedition against Verona, which only resulted in the devastation of the country, and the Guelphs remained in captivity. Did their friends make a request to St Antony, or was he moved by a spontaneous impulse of kindness? Rolandino cannot give an answer to this. The fact remains that the Saint besieged the authorities of Verona, Ezzelino and his advisers, with entreaties, but without success. The chronicler of Padua tells us that the prisoners were not released till after the death of St Antony, in 1232, thanks to the new Podestà of Padua, Wiffredo da Lucino.[1]

That is history, this is legend. According to Surius, Ezzelino in the early days of his tyrannical government ordered a great massacre of the Veronese. St Antony, hearing of this, went to him and said: "Thy head, oh most cruel tyrant and savage beast, is threatened with a terrible punishment by God.

[1] Rolandino, *op. cit.*, lib. iii., chap. 5, pp. 202, 203. Cf. *Ricciardi Comitis Sancti Bonifacii Vita, incerto auctore conscripta*, in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. viii., p. 126. Milan, 1726.

How long wilt thou continue to shed the blood of the innocent?" And he addressed to him many other severe reproaches. The satellites of the tyrant waited for a sign from him to rush upon the bold Franciscan. To their intense astonishment Ezzelino became as meek as a lamb, placed his own girdle round his neck, threw himself at the feet of St Antony, humbly confessing his faults, and promising to follow his advice as to how to cure himself of them. Later he said to his followers: "Do not be astonished. I saw a divine light emanating from this man's countenance, and my terror was so great that I thought I was about to be cast into hell." From this time forward he evinced great devotion to the Saint, and as long as the latter lived he abstained from indulging in the crimes he had formerly committed.[1] This anecdote rests entirely on an anachronism. The massacre at Verona which is said to have caused St Antony's demand did not, as a matter of fact, take place till twenty-five years after his death.

The version given in the *Liber Miraculorum* is still more impossible to accept. It is based on the assumption that Ezzelino was living in Padua, now he did not enter the city till 1237. It adds this detail. At the end of the interview Ezzelino is said to have sent presents to St Antony, which the latter refused. After having done this he learnt that the messengers had orders to kill him if he had accepted them. Ezzelino, if this was the case, must have known

[1] Surius, p. 193.—*Cf.* Father Hilary of Paris, *op. cit.*, pp. 88, 89.

very little about the Saint and the Franciscan Order. It is desired to place this interview in 1228 so as to render it more probable. But how is it that Rolandino, who has given us so many details concerning the events of this time, does not mention this incident? As a matter of fact the stories related by Surius and the *Liber Miraculorum* are improbable and pure fabrications.[1]

St Antony also established at Padua a confraternity of penitents called the *Colombini*. He had converted some heretics and sinners, and had bidden them purchase a house in the town. There they built a chapel dedicated to the Virgin of the Dove, whence they took their name. They were clothed in a long rough ash-coloured tunic, round which they wore a cord similar to the Saint's.[2]

Surius attributes to the preaching of the Saint the appearance at Padua of the first flagellants.[3] We have already expressed our opinion as to the value of this writer's evidence: on this occasion we have particular reasons for suspecting it. There were no flagellants in Padua during the life-time of St Antony. Contemporary writers do not mention

[1] *Liber Miraculorum*, pp. 139, 140.

[2] It is Arbusti who read, in the archives of the Confraternity of the Colombini, the statement that they were founded by Antony. The MS. no longer exists, and we only know of the passage in Arbusti from Salvagnini, pp. 167-177. However, Dr Lempp, in the review mentioned above, vol. xii., p. 435, has not the least doubt of its truth. Scardeonius, *De Antiquitate urbis Patavii*, p. 99, Bâle, 1560, says that Antony founded at Padua an important confraternity of men still living in the world: we do not know if this should be identified with the Colombini.

[3] Surius, p. 193.

them. When about thirty years later, in 1260, the first flagellants appeared in the town, Salimbene and the author usually called *Monachus Patavinus*, speak of them as something new. Perhaps the founding of the Colombini, owing to confusion, led to the belief that the flagellants existed at the same time.

We have no other entirely trustworthy details concerning St Antony's sojourn at Padua. E. Salvagnini, remembering that Bl. Albert le Grand was teaching in 1228 in Padua in the monastery of St Augustine, thinks it likely that the two eminent friars knew each other. But he does not venture to go further than this, and rightly. As we have already said he is one of those critics who believe that St Antony did not come to Padua till 1229. The same author is a little more venturesome when he speaks of the relations between the Saint and Giordano Sforzatè, prior of the monastery of St Benedict, one of the most remarkable figures of the time, from the threefold point of view of talent, energy and saintliness. But here again there is no proof. We find, it is true, the following anecdote in the *Liber Miraculorum*: "One day, while he was listening (this refers to St Antony) at Padua to an abbot belonging to the Order of Black Friars who was preaching, and recalling to his hearers the speech of St Paul to Dionysius (this is plainly a reference to St Paul and St Dionysius, the Areopagist), he was profoundly touched by the sweetness of the divine words, and remained for some time in a state of ecstasy." The name "Black Monks" was usually applied to the Benedictins. Giordano Forzatè was already

prior of St Benedict's Monastery when St Antony came to Padua. But evidence from the *Liber Miraculorum*, as we have already said several times, is not sufficient to carry conviction.[1]

Again, tradition tells us that the blessed Helena Enselmini was the spiritual daughter of St Antony. The special prayers in the Paduan breviary refer to this in very guarded terms.[2] For information on this point, we must go to the new Bollandists, who have edited the documents relating to this holy woman, with a preface such as they know so well how to write. It is a fact that this lady belonged to the Order of Poor-Ladies, and that she was living in the monastery of Arcella when St Antony was at Padua. But that is all we do know. And, on the other

[1] E. Salvagnini, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-146. *Liber Miraculorum*, in the *Anal. franc.*, vol. iii., p. 132.

[2] Here is the breviary text for the 5th November, lesson 4. "Helena se religioni addixit in suburbano Arcellae veteris monasterio, sancti Francisci opera constructo . . ., instructa a sancto Antonio, quem in via spiritus ducem et magistrum habuisse fertur." On the other hand, it is very doubtful, judging from the account of the funeral ceremonies in the earliest biography (*Port. Mon. hist.*, p. 120), if Antony ever filled any office whatever at Arcella. We ask how this idea can have grown up, according to which he is the director of this St Helena. In the monastery of the Poor-Ladies at Arcella, the custom grew up of adding to the saints in the *Confiteor*, the Blessed Basil, the Blessed Francis, the Blessed Antony, the Blessed Clara, and the Blessed Helena. Was it therefore imagined that Helena had the same connexion with Antony as Clara had with Francis? When imagination gives itself rein, its logic is often remarkably strange. For the whole question, *cf. Acta Sanctorum*, vol. ii., of November, pp. 509-517. *Cf.* also *Liber Conformitatum*, p. 106, v°, and Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 505-514, where he mentions an undated inscription which called Bl. Helena "discipula S. Antonii."

hand, notice this carefully: Sicco Polentone, about the middle of the fifteenth century, wrote a biography of both St Antony and this holy woman. Now, in these two works, he makes no allusion whatsoever to any connection between the two. Bartholomew of Pisa, in speaking of Helena Enselmini in the *Liber Conformitatum*, maintains the same silence. We must therefore have other information before we can settle our doubts concerning so delicate a point.[1]

The same author to whom we have referred earlier, E. Salvagnini, mentions another disciple of St Antony, Luke Belludi, asserting that he was "his companion during his life-time, and afterwards his faithful successor in the apostolate." He adds a little further on, "Luke, who, it appears, became St Antony's disciple on joining the Order about 1227, followed him everywhere . . . when he relinquished the duties of Provincial. Luke, with St Antony, partook of Tiso da Camposampiero's hospitality, was present when he died at Arcella, and perhaps played an important part in settling the quarrels which arose concerning the burial of the Saint." But he gives no proof, quotes no authority. This is what our own researches show us. We know, from Bartholomew of Pisa, that a certain Brother Lucas was the companion of St Antony, and that he was buried near the tomb of the Saint. He adds

[1] *Liber Conformitatum*, pp. 82 and 155.—*Acta Sanctorum*, vol. iii., for February, p. 3.—*I Codici della Bibliotheca Antoniana di Padova descritti ed illustrati dal Bibliothecario P. M. Antonio Josa, Min. Conv.*, p. 46. Padua, 1886.

that his body was honoured, and he mentions his sermons, saying that they began with these words: *Narraverunt mihi iniqui fabulationes, sed non ut lex tua.* And that is all: he does not mention his surname, Belludi. On the other hand, the early Bollandists mention Brother Lucas de Belludi among the persons whose lives they do not give, adding this very significant remark: "We have not yet been able to find out whether the Church accorded him public worship." Finally, Father Josa, in his catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of St Antony, mentions the *Sermones per annum* of Brother Lucas de Belludi, stating that among his works is to be found a sermon preached on the removal of St Antony's remains. He tells us he was his companion, but on what authority we do not know. In short, we must say the question is not settled, and is sufficiently complicated to demand new and laborious research.

In conclusion: all that we know with the greatest certainty concerning the life of St Antony deals with his sojourn at Padua. But even on this point we are very far from possessing all the information which would enable us to form a complete and vivid idea of it. We should have liked to realise the influence which his zeal, his eloquence, and above all, his holiness, must have brought him in this town where men's passions were so strong, but where at the same time faith was so living, and exercised such great power over the masses.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEATH, FUNERAL OBSEQUIES, AND CANONISATION OF ST ANTONY—CONCLUSION

Meanwhile St Antony felt that his end was near. At the beginning of Lent, 1231, he had miraculously escaped an attack of the devil. One night whilst he was sleeping, the devil seized him by the throat and attempted to strangle him. St Antony had thereupon called upon the Virgin Mary and made the sign of the cross, upon which the Evil One vanished, and the cell was resplendent with celestial light. A Brother to whom St Antony had related this event was still living to bear testimony to it.[1] But the Saint was now worn out by labour, and overwhelmed with infirmities, and death could not be long in coming to him.

A fortnight before his death St Antony was standing on a little hill whence he could view the beautiful plain on which Padua stands. He began to praise its incomparable situation. Then turning to the Brother who had accompanied him, he prophesied that the city would enjoy a great honour, without explaining the nature and cause of it. The early legend which preserved this anecdote explains

[1] *Portug. Monum. historica*, p. 118.

that the Saint saw beforehand all the glory that was to be shed upon Padua through his own personality.[1]

Summer of 1231 had come. Seeing that the harvest claimed all helpers, he did not wish to detain the crowds who hastened to hear him preach, and he reserved his sermons for a more favourable time. He sought a retired spot, and thought he could find such in the peaceful solitude of Camposampiero. The lord of this place, that same Tiso whom we have already met with when speaking of the struggles between Padua and Verona, was a friend of the Lesser Brothers, and the owner of the house which they inhabited in this district. He was greatly delighted at St Antony's decision, and endeavoured to render all possible service to the man of God who had come to him.

Not far from the monastery Tiso owned an estate covered with forests. There, among the finest trees, a walnut-tree rose high above the others, from the stem of which sprang six branches in the form of a crown. The Saint, struck by the beauty of this tree, asked if a cell might be built there for his use. The place was solitary, extremely quiet, and very favourable to contemplation. Tiso eagerly acceded to this wish, and himself prepared the Saint's abode with rushes and branches of willow. Two other cells were also got ready for St Antony's com-

[1] *Portug. Monum. historica*, p. 119. From this point we shall only summarise the narrative in the earliest biography. That is why we think it useless to multiply our notes. We shall content ourselves with indicating what we have drawn from other sources; and we refer, for the whole of this chapter, to p. 120 *et seq.* of the text of the *Port. Monum. hist.*

panions. The Saint gave himself up entirely to the contemplation of celestial things. In this airy dwelling he was nearer to heaven, and he seemed to be preparing for his flight towards the divine country. The 13th June in this year was a Friday. The Saint came out of his cell at dinner-time, and, in accordance with his custom, sat down to table with the Brothers. He suddenly felt faint. His weakness increased, and he rose from the table, supported by his companions, and threw himself on a bed. Understanding that death was approaching, he said to one of them, Ruggero: "If you approve of it, I will go to Padua, to the monastery of St Mary, to avoid troubling the Brothers here." Ruggero agreed to this, but the objections of the other Brothers had to be overcome as they opposed his departure with all their might. They got ready a vehicle, and St Antony came at last in sight of Padua. A Brother, who had come to meet him, saw that he was so ill that he begged him not to go to the monastery of St Mary, but to allow himself to be taken to Arcella, in the suburb of Capo di Ponte, where the Brothers Minor had another house close to the Convent of the Poor Ladies. St Antony was finally persuaded to do this when the Brother pointed out to him that the visits of the Paduans would not give him the necessary quiet if he went to St Mary.

On arrival at Arcella, the illness made rapid progress. St Antony at first evinced anxiety. When he had regained his calmness of spirit, he made his confession, received absolution, and began to sing

the hymn to the Virgin Mary: *O gloriosa Domina, Excelsa super sidera. . . .*[1] When he had ended, he lifted his eyes towards heaven, and kept them fixed there with an expression of wonderment. The Brother, who was attending on him, having asked what he was looking at, he replied: "I see my Saviour." Seeing that the end was near, the Brothers wanted to give him Extreme Unction. When one of them brought the sacred oil, the Saint looked at him and said: "Brother, there is no need for you to render me this service, for I have this unction within me. Nevertheless it is good, and gives me happiness."[2] He stretched forth his hands, then clasped them, and sang the whole of the penitential psalms with the Brothers. Half an hour later his soul was released from the prison of his body. The latter presented all the appearance of sleep. The hands, which had become white, were more beautiful than in life. The other limbs remained flexible to the touch. If the martyr had been disappointed in his hopes, and failed in that way to secure the admiration of multitudes, many miracles were at least to avouch his sainthood.

[1] This is the hymn for lauds in the Roman office of the Holy Virgin. But the two first verses which we quote have been replaced by these: *O gloriosa Virginum, Sublimis inter sidera.*

[2] See, in Appendix I., what we say concerning the authenticity of this last phrase. But if it were an interpolation added later, what remains of St Antony's statement would only prove one thing: that he did not regard the receiving of extreme unction as essential. Raynaldi, in the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. xxi., p. 41, has replied excellently concerning this point to the Magdebourg centuriators.

The early legend, very cautious concerning the life of St Antony, gives us long details about the incidents that took place on the occasion of his burial. We do not wish to translate it in his prolix and bombastic style; it is sufficient for us to notice the most characteristic facts, and those which show most clearly the esteem in which the people of Padua held him. We must not be astonished, however, if on this occasion, as on many similar ones, the people display entirely human passions united to feelings of devotion.

The Franciscans of Arcella foresaw that difficulties were about to arise concerning the place of St Antony's burial. They had not a chapel of their own, since they resided there solely for the benefit of the Poor Ladies. But the latter possessed one, and would have been most happy to have received the remains of the Saint. On the other hand, the latter had dwelt, not at Arcella, but at St Mary, that is to say, at the monastery belonging to the Brothers Minor within the city of Padua. He had, indeed, on his death-bed, commanded the Brother who tended him to see that he was buried in this monastery which he loved above all others. Meanwhile, until the competent authority had announced its decision, it was resolved to keep silence concerning the death of St Antony. Useless precaution. The news soon got about, and the children ran about the town crying, "He is dead, the Holy Father, St Antony is dead!" Then the people of Padua came hurrying out, especially those who lived in Capo di Ponti, where Arcella was situated; these formed a

guard to protect themselves from unforeseen attacks. When the Brothers Minor of St Mary came to carry away the precious remains, they were forced to retire before the decided attitude of the armed people who surrounded the corpse. Thus driven away, they appealed to the bishop, who decided in their favour, and claimed on their behalf the support of the Podestà. But the people from the suburb refused to yield, and swore to sacrifice everything, their persons, their property, sooner than allow the body of the Saint to be taken away. A truce had to be made, and it was decided to defer everything until the arrival of the Provincial. To prevent popular disturbances, the humble dwelling of the Brothers Minor was locked and bolted. But this precaution was of no avail: the crowd broke down the barriers on the pretext of viewing the body of St Antony. At the same time, the faithful from the neighbouring towns and castles came into Padua to see these venerated remains, and, if possible, to touch them. Those who could not get near, threw in at the windows and doors, or hung on to sticks, things they wanted consecrated by coming into contact with them. The season was warm, and it seemed unwise to leave the Saint's body exposed to the fresh air: the Brothers therefore wished to give him a temporary burial. Then, through the crowd the rumour spread: "The body has been abducted." Immediately there was an uproar among the people from Capo di Ponti, and a certain number of them attacked the monastery with sticks and weapons. The coffin had to be disinterred, and the people did

not retire till they had shaken it, to be quite sure it was not empty.

The Provincial arrived, and after having delayed his decision until the people had had time to calm down again, he pronounced in favour of St Mary. At the Communal Council he had adversaries who had been won over by the entreaties of the Poor Ladies. But when he had reminded them of the last wishes of the Saint, he finally overcame them: the bishop, the final arbiter, took his view and appealed to the Podestà for support. This took place on the fourth day after the death of the Saint, and it was decided that the obsequies should take place on the morrow.

To avoid any disturbance at Capo di Ponte, it was arranged not to use the bridge which gave its name to the suburb, but to make a bridge of boats between Arcella and the town, for the funeral *cortège* to pass over. The people of the neighbourhood destroyed this bridge with hatchets, and armed themselves to resist every attack from the town. The Podestà saw that he must act with resolution. He summoned to the *Salone*, that is the large hall where the people were accustomed to assemble, all the citizens of Padua. He ordered the people from the suburbs to remain within the town, and not to return to their own homes on that day, on penalty of the confiscation of all their property.

After this order had been given the bishop went to Arcella to see about the removal of St Antony's body. We need scarcely add that the obsequies were magnificent. First came the Podestà and the

principal men of the city, who were proud to carry the Saint's bier upon their shoulders. The streets could not contain the crowd of spectators. The people, according to the custom then in vogue, carried candles, so that the whole city appeared illumined. The bishop celebrated the Mass at St Mary's, after which the body was buried in this church as St Antony had desired.

The confidence of the people in the Saint to whom they had given such magnificent funeral honours was very great. From that very day sick persons were brought to his tomb, and contact with that alone restored them to health. Others, who had not been able to get near it on account of the crowds, were brought to the threshold of the church, and, before the eyes of the people, were cured of their sickness. The report of these miracles spread very rapidly, and the faithful believers organised regular pilgrimages to St Mary. Bands of pilgrims came, with banners flying, and bare-footed; the most delicate, and the haughtiest, ladies and men of noble birth, all heartily joined in this devotion. The pious bishop, Jacopo Corrado, desired to take off his shoes in the place sanctified by the presence of these holy remains. The Podestà did the same when he arrived surrounded by his escort, and accompanied by an immense crowd of people. The students of the University were noticeable for their enthusiasm and devotion. The crowd of pilgrims included many people from other lands: there were not only people from Lombardy, Venice, Vicenza,

Trevisia and Aquileia, but also Slavs, Germans and Hungarians.

The child-like chronicler lays stress on a matter of minor importance, which we should like to pass over in silence. The pilgrims, he tells us, used to come with such huge candles that it would have been impossible to take them into the church without breaking them. They were sometimes so heavy that sixteen men could scarcely carry one of them on their shoulders, and to draw them along two pairs of oxen had to be harnessed to the cart. Some were in the form of candelabras, and were decorated with the most varied ornament, representing lilies, branches of vine, and flowers of all kinds. We notice, in regard to this, that the custom of burning a candle in honour of St Antony dates from the time when the cultus of the Saint began; the faithful of that century displayed more generosity in these matters than our contemporaries. Moreover, these pilgrims did not forget to practise a form of devotion which did far more honour to their patron Saint. They showed such a great desire to receive the Sacrament of Penance that there were not enough Friars in St Mary's monastery to hear their confessions. The sick likewise experienced the benefit of the sacrament: those who came to be cured had to receive it in a right frame of mind if they wished to enjoy the effects of the divine grace.

In presence of these miracles there was soon but one wish and one demand: Rome must be

requested to canonise Antony. Less than a month after his death a request to this effect was made by the bishop and the clergy, the Podestà and the citizens of Padua. The Pope at that time was, as we have already said, Gregory IX., formerly Cardinal Hugolin, who under this name had been a patron of the Franciscan Order. He had, moreover, known Antony somewhat intimately, and had appreciated the eminent holiness that distinguished him. He therefore received the envoys from Padua with great friendliness, and on the unanimous advice of the Sacred College confided the examination of the matter into the hands of Bishop Jacopo Corrado, the Prior of the Benedictines, Giordano Sforzatè, and the Prior of the Dominicans. A great number of miracles was brought forward, and some of them were duly verified. After a thorough and minute inquiry the bishop and the Podestà as well as the University sent a new request to the Holy Father, this time supported by two celebrated personages. These were Otto of Monte Ferrato and Jacopo, Bishop-elect of Palestrina. They were charged with a mission of peace to Lombardy, and the March of Trevisia, and had visited Padua on this occasion, and confirmed by their evidence the narrative of the miracles which had been submitted to Rome. The cause was thus making good progress. There were indeed some of the cardinals who proposed to keep to the customs of the Church, holding that they should wait a little while, so as not to incur the reproach of acting precipitately. But one of these had a dream which triumphed

over his scruples and made him an eager upholder of a prompt decision.

Dr E. Lempp has laid great stress on the rapidity with which the process of canonisation was carried out, and on the eagerness of Gregory IX. to place Antony in the ranks of the saints.[1] He sees in this such an unheard-of event that he thinks he ought to try and find the cause of it. He believes he has discovered it in political projects: Gregory IX. in his struggle against Frederick II. had as his opponents Ezzelino III. and the town of Verona, and he wished to obtain a permanent alliance with Padua. It is possible that the Pope may have been glad to be reconciled with the Podestà and the inhabitants of the town. But we think that the Saint was canonised so quickly because of the miracles which brought him under the notice of the Pope, and because it was difficult to resist the pressure of popular fervour.

Cardinal John, bishop of Sabina, who was charged with the duty of making the final decision concerning the miracles, accepted forty-seven of them. The Sovereign Pontiff considered that this number was sufficient for him to proceed to the work of canonisation without delay. It took place at Spoleto on the day of Pentecost, May 30th, 1232. Antony had not yet been dead a year. A brief account of the miracles

[1] *Cf.* the *Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xiii., pp. 38-43. It seems to us that in everything he says of the Saint's public life Dr Lempp has permitted himself to be influenced by Ghibelline prejudices: we do not cast suspicion on his impartiality, but we think he has viewed these matters in a less calm and serene frame of mind than he is usual with him.

worked by the intercession of the thaumaturgist was read in the presence of Gregory IX. Then the Pope declared that his name was inscribed in the list of saints, and decided that his festival should be celebrated on the anniversary of his death. The *Liber Miraculorum*, the narratives in which we never vouch for, adds that after the reading of the decree and the *Te Deum* the Holy Father intoned the anthem, *O Docter optime*, accompanied by all the clergy.[1]

The curiosity of the faithful devotees of St Antony will not doubtless be completely satisfied until they know the history of his worship throughout the centuries. But this history cannot be traced at present for lack of the necessary documents. Moreover it would go beyond the limits of this modest monograph. Still we are able to state that devotion to this Saint increased, especially in Padua, and assumed such proportions that it is closely connected with the history of that town throughout the centuries. The people of Padua always regarded St Antony as belonging to them; they called upon him in their hours of distress, and when deliverance came they attributed it to his powerful intervention. Padua, conquered in 1237 by Ezzelino III., was finally delivered from his tyranny on June 19th, 1256. This was during the Saint's week, and the people of Padua did not fail to see in this coincidence a proof that he had assisted in obtaining for them the so long desired freedom. The *Liber Miraculorum* has handed down to us an echo of the intercessions which he made on its behalf. It states that St

[1] *Liber Mirac.*, p. 142.

Antony appeared to the Guardian of the monastery at Padua, Brother Bartolomeo Corradini, just as he was praying at the Saint's tomb for the liberation of the town, and predicted that deliverance should come on his own day.

Without wishing however to write a history, a task for which we are not sufficiently equipped, we may say that among the proofs which the people of Padua have given of their devotion to St Antony, none is more eloquent than the memorial basilica, called by his name, or more simply, *Il Santo*. No one has yet been able to decide when the work was begun, but it was not finished in 1263 when it was thought wise to transfer thither the relics of the Saint. Then it was perceived that his body had been subjected to the law of nature, and had passed through all the stages of decomposition, with the exception of the tongue, which was still intact.[1] St Bonaventure, who presided at the transference as Minister-general of the Order, venerated it and kissed it, and he ordered it to be put apart in a reliquary. To-day pilgrims can still testify to the continuance of the miracle when they adore the relic in the basilica.

The worship of St Antony was not however restricted to Padua, and from the fourteenth century onwards it flourished throughout Italy, particularly at Rome, Siena and Naples. Pope Sixtus IV. and St Bernardine of Siena greatly helped to spread it.

[1] *Liber Mirac.*, p. 157. Salimbene, *op. cit.*, p. 327, relates the translation made by St Bonaventura, but without mentioning the miracle of the tongue.

From the sixteenth century it spread over the whole of the Catholic world, and to-day we are witnesses of the marvellous progress it has made.

We wish we could describe the outward aspect of St Antony, imitating in this so many biographers. Unfortunately, we have very little information on this subject. We have only the description given by Sicco Polentone about 1433, and this Chronicler appears to have borrowed it from a passage in the earliest biography, which we gave when relating the story of the death of the Saint. Whether this is so or not, here is what the Paduan Chronicler tells us: "St Antony was chaste throughout his life. He had a dark complexion, for the Spaniards, the neighbours of the Moors, are all dark. He was below middle height, but corpulent and dropsical. His face was refined, and expressed piety so strongly that at once, and without even knowing him, one was conscious of a beautiful character, and a holy man. His skin, which during his lifetime was dark and rough owing to his Spanish origin, became on account of his austere life, his delicate health, white and delicate after his death. Death, far from altering his features and looks, bestowed upon him a more serene and happy expression, so that he did not look as if he were dead, but merely sleeping."[1]

Before concluding this narrative in which we have been obliged to pause at every page to discuss proofs, and estimate their value, in which we have often had to ask ourselves if we had found out the

[1] Sicco Polentone, apud Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

truth, and in which we must have often wearied the patience of our readers, we think it will be useful to sum up briefly the spiritual aspect of the Saint according to the characteristics which can be most reliably attributed to him. His dominating feature seems to have been his singular energy. It was not for nothing that the Saint belonged to a race of Crusaders, encamped on the banks of the Tagus, to protect from the Moors the new kingdom which they had taken from them. Like those heroes St Antony feared neither the terrors nor the fatigues of combat: only he applied his energy in another direction: he applied it to the work of spiritual perfection and the salvation of souls. He abandoned a worldly life early because he found it full of perils, and he wished at all costs to keep himself pure in the sight of God. And as he did not find himself sufficiently protected against the snares of the world in the first monastery where he sought shelter, he did not hesitate to leave Lisbon for Coimbra. In the solitude of the cloister he saw that he must not only save himself, but also labour at the salvation of others. In order to become a more useful labourer in his Master's vineyard he devoted himself to study, especially to the study of the Holy Scripture, so that he became the *Ark of the Testament*.

Then an unexpected incident aroused within him a new ambition, and gave a different direction to his enthusiasm. Prostrate before the relics of the martyrs of Morocco, he ardently longed for their death and glory, and in order to share in their joy

he did not hesitate to leave the Canons Regular and become a Brother Minor. It was not long before he set out for Morocco, where however his hopes were disappointed. But he had the most determined intention of leading a really apostolic life, and nothing could prevent him from carrying this out: in the heroic Order of St Francis of Assisi he was distinguished for his disinterestedness, his austerity, and his fervour. For some time he appeared to be simply this: a very humble Brother entirely devoted to the contemplative life.

Then Providence reveals what he really is, and he becomes a teacher and preacher. The knowledge he had acquired while among the Regular Canons he preserved in his marvellous memory, and he made use of it in the saving of souls. St Francis spoke like a simple minstrel (*giullare*) of the good God, and was a very homely and but poorly educated Saint. St Antony differed from him in his mode of exposition, which was more learned, more delicately poetical, and more allegorical, and his sermons contained constant references to the Bible. Both sought to labour for the glory of God, but by what different means! St Francis was never angered against any one: St Antony in his impassioned zeal appears to have spared no one, and in this he may be compared with St Bernard. Like the latter he had an extraordinary influence over the crowd, whom he roused and carried along with him. Like him again he found rest from the fatigues of the apostolic life in contemplation; and it was into solitude he retired to commune

with his thoughts for the last time just before his death.

Scarcely was he dead before miracles without number took place at his tomb, and so caused him to be worshipped by the people. The halo of the thaumaturgist which illumines him dazzles the minds of the believers to such a degree that they forget to admire the virtues which distinguish him—the purity of the man who remained chaste throughout his life, the austerity of the monk, the zeal and eloquence of the apostle. These are the characteristics which we ought to remember and note carefully. If, however, lack of documents has not permitted us to make St Antony better known, we are yet confident of having worked for his fame by exhibiting his saintliness, not in the mirage of legend, but in the true light of history.

APPENDICES

I

We think it is right to examine briefly the most important documents we have used when writing this book. Our readers will be better able to judge the authorities we have consulted, and amend our judgments if they think them defective. They will at the same time become acquainted with the controversies concerning St Antony which have arisen in our days, and seem likely to rage for a considerable time.

1. The principal source, which is generally regarded as the most reliable and least open to doubt, is supplied to us by the *Portugalliae Monumenta historica*, vol. i., *Scriptores*, pp. 116-130. Lisbon, 1856. The edition is based on two manuscripts in the monastery of Alcobaza, Nos. 256 and 293, especially the former. The work consists of two parts—the life of the Saint, and then an account of his miracles.[1] Perhaps these two parts are not by the same author. The biographer, after having written out the first part, may simply have added the second, which was doubtless an official document written on the occasion of the canonisation of the Saint.

In any case it is the first part which we have specially made use of; it is important to determine, as far as possible, its date and authority. The author states that he was an eye-witness of some of the events which he describes. He says also that he was told certain details by Soeiro Viegas II., bishop of Lisbon, and we know that this prelate died on January 29th, 1232. He was thus

[1] As this first part is divided by the anonymous author into two, which relate respectively the life itself, the death, and the funeral ceremonies, one might say that the book consists of three parts. But we did not desire to complicate our exposition.

well informed, and must have been writing a short time after the canonisation of St Antony. The fact that he questioned the bishop concerning him seems to indicate that he then was thinking of writing St Antony's life. The candour with which he expresses himself in certain places is a sure guarantee of his veracity. Our knowledge does not allow us to fix more precisely the date when this part was written.

We do not know who the author was. Father Hilary of Paris tells us that he was John of Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury. But as this prelate was born in 1240, he could not have known Soeiro Viegas who died in 1232. Father H. Denifle notes how the style of this work resembles that of the earliest life of St Francis, by Thomas of Celano.[1] But these resemblances do not prove that the two books were by the same author. Let us beware of too hasty conclusions, and wait for more reliable evidence.

The book is written in a somewhat diffuse style, in far-fetched and inaccurate Latin, and long perorations too often take the place of facts. This is the order followed by the author. He gives the life of St Antony down to his ordination at Forli in detail. Then he describes very vaguely and briefly his preaching during the following eight years (1222-1230). He does not say a word about his sojourn in France, and he is silent concerning the towns of Italy in which the Saint may have preached the Gospel during this period. This is an omission which we cannot but note with surprise. It is said that the biography was written when Brother Elias was Minister-general, and that it was awkward to recall the time when the latter was in conflict with St Antony. But this reason is not sufficient to explain so complete a silence concerning the doings of our Saint during such a long period. Moreover the antagonism between the two Lesser Brothers has never been proved. The matter therefore still remains a complete mystery for us. The biography ends with a somewhat detailed account of St Antony's last year at Padua, and a still longer account of the circumstances connected with his obsequies and canonisation. Then follows the part to which we have already referred, which relates to the miracles mentioned as a reason for

[1] Father Hilaire de Paris, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-26. Father Denifle, *Die Entstehung*, p. 282, note 240.

the canonisation: as these miracles took place after the death of the Saint, we have not included them in our account.

2. After this work, we must note another which has been taken from the former literally, though only in a fragmentary manner, in drawing up the lessons for the office of St Antony in a breviary of the Brothers Minor of Assisi, written between 1263 and 1302.[1] We speak of it because of an omission from which a conclusion has been drawn which we cannot allow. It refers to the incident when St Antony said that extreme unction was not necessary for him, adding: *Verumtamen bonum mihi est, et bene placet mihi.* The lesson in the above-mentioned breviary does not contain this sentence, whence Dr E. Lempp concludes that it is an interpolation intended to explain the Saint's meaning. The learned doctor's reasoning in no wise convinces us. The Lucerne text, as well as the Alcobaza text, No. 286, has the sentence.[2] It is more natural to think that the author of the breviary omitted it inadvertently, or from some other motive.

3. Father A. M. Josa, librarian of the library of St Antony at Padua, has given us another version of the legend from the *Port. Mon. historica*, but with important alterations, to which we have referred earlier in discussing the date of St Antony's ordination. The version thus altered is, without the least doubt, later than the first text of the *Monumenta.* It includes fourteen miracles which we do not find in that text, and among these is one belonging to the year 1243, and another to 1278. As the text of this legend is to be found in the library of St Antony at Padua, Dr E. Lempp says with considerable probability: "This version, with its corrections and additions, gives us a picture of the Saint as he would appear to the Brothers Minor of Padua at the end of the thirteenth century." We have discussed earlier the amount of authority that can be attached to this legend, without coming, however, to any definite conclusion. It appears to be less, however, than that of the *Monumenta.*[3]

Since we have here the opportunity we will refer to another

---

[1] *Cf.* Azzoguidi, *op. cit.*, note 5, pp. 65-76.

[2] We also find the gist of it in the *Vita auctore anonymo* of the Bollandists, vol. cited, p. 205.

[3] *Cf.* p. 49, note 2. *Cf. Zeitschrift* of Brieger, vol. xi., pp. 183-189.

brief legend relative, likewise, to St Antony, which Father Josa found in the same manuscript, and which he published in the same volume with the preceding one. It has clearly been inspired by this other one. It is more fragmentary, and told in an oratorical, diffuse, and often obscure style. The author seems to have wished to produce a literary rather than an historical work. It gives, however, few new facts, and is often very inaccurate. It is posterior to 1293, for the author promises to relate miracles which took place in this year under his very eyes.[1]

In the course of our work we call these two documents, the first and second life by Father Josa.

4. The text of the *Monumenta* is reproduced with interpolations in a manuscript bearing the label xvi.—F6—4A in the *Archivium* of the Capuchin Monastery at Lucerne. Father Hilary of Paris has edited these documents,[2] taking care to publish separately the early text, and the later interpolations. It is necessary to form an estimate of these interpolations. They date from 1337, at least since the MS. was then finished. They were borrowed from a source which had been drawn upon for the *Liber Miraculorum*, as a comparison we have made between Father Hilary's publication and this compilation proves. Let us add that this same manuscript from Lucerne relates the story of the Saint's interview with Ezzelino just as Surius does later; but we have shown that the latter's narrative is not worthy of belief. Finally, these interpolations appear to us of very doubtful authority, and we have not cared to rely on them.

5. We have to speak now of a text published by the Bollandists in the *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. iii., June, pp. 199 *et sqq.*, under this title: *Vita auctore anonymo valde antiquo.* This document dates back very far, for it is reproduced almost word for word in the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais (with the exception of the miracles, which were copied from the text of the *Monumenta*).[3] Now Vincent de Beauvais' work was finished in 1244, hence the legend in question is earlier than this date. On the other hand, it is later than the text

[1] *Cf.* p. 51, note 1.

[2] *Cf.* p. 52, note 1.

[3] *Speculum historiale plustrati fratris Vincentii, ordinis Praedicatorum . . . , per Antonium Koburger*, book xxxi., chap. xxxii., Nuremberg, 1483.

of the *Monumenta*, from which it seems to have been adapted. It includes the facts given by this work, but describes them in more precise language; it does not give the preface to it; and it gives an anecdote from Thomas of Celano—that of St Francis' apparition during the preaching of St Antony—which is not to be found in the text of the *Monumenta*, nor in the first life by Father Josa.

Some writers wish to attribute this legend from the *Acta Sanctorum* to Julian of Spire: the arguments brought forward have not convinced us. In any case we have here a very old narrative of great value. Unfortunately, except the anecdote mentioned above,[1] it does scarcely more than repeat what we have already had in the *Monumenta*.

6. The documents we have just been examining tell us nothing of St Antony's sojourn in France (with the exception of the anecdote related by an anonymous Bollandist writer). Great importance therefore attaches to a life of St Antony which gives us interesting details concerning this stay. This work is the *Vita B. Antonii, de Ordine Fratrum Minorum, a fratre Joanne Rigaldi de eodem Ordine, ordinata*[2] which has been published this year (1900) from the manuscript 270 in the Bordeaux Library by Father Ferdinand—Marie d'Araules. Jean Rigaud, a Franciscan, was bishop of Treguier in 1317, and died in 1323. He lived, therefore, near enough to the last years of St Antony to have met and questioned Brothers Minor who had known the Saint. He tells us, in formal language, that he learned of the miracles in the Creux des Arènes from Brothers who had been present at the sermon. He shows a constant desire to tell the truth, and gladly names his witnesses. According, also, to Bernard Guy he was a Limousin. We therefore believe that we may accept without difficulty all the facts connected with the sojourn of St Antony in France. As to those which took place in Italy, for which he adduces no evidence, there is more difficulty at least in the details. Jean Rigaud was far distant from these places, and the account would have been much altered in passing through many

[1] It also contains certain miracles after the Saint's death not included in the *Monumenta*, but which we were not able to make use of.

[2] *Cf.* p. 62, note 1.

hands before reaching him. We must not forget that the miracle of the broken leg, attributed by him to St Antony, is related of St Peter Martyr by a Dominican writer. Furthermore, Jean Rigaud places this miracle in Spain, which would be a serious mistake if we did not believe that it was merely an error of the copyist. In any case we may say this text is of great value, and that Father Ferdinand-Marie has done us a great service by making it known to us.

7. We have often quoted from an important document published first of all by Wadding, then by the Bollandists, who took it from him and called it *Liber Miraculorum*,[1] and lastly, by the Franciscans of Quaracchi, in the *Chronicle of the twenty-four Generals*. We have kept the name given it by the Bollandists: it is well chosen, since it is almost entirely occupied with the question of miracles. It is a compilation which dates from the end of the fourteenth century, the materials of which are of very varying values: unfortunately, it does not seem possible, in the present state of our knowledge, to distinguish between the true and that which is open to conjecture. But it is of considerable importance from the point of view of the history of the literature connected with St Antony. It is from this collection that the authors of the fifteenth century and those following have drawn, without hesitation, to fill up the gaps in the original legends. That is why we have quoted from this work when discussing the legends.

8. Surius edited, with regard to style and composition, a life of St Antony "seriously and faithfully written down by a Brother Minor," as he tells us in his preface. He adds that he merely improved the style and omitted unimportant details. He published this life in his book, *De Probatis sanctorum vitis* (1st edition, 1576), on June 13th. But we know nothing of the Franciscan writer whom he has thus made use of, and we do not even know when he lived. A careful examination of Surius's version shows us that some of the materials are borrowed from the primitive legend, some from later documents, collected from we know not where. But throughout this version there are too many doubtful statements for us to be able to quote it as authentic

---

[1] *Cf.* p. 9, note 1.

evidence. Therefore we have reported these narratives with reservations.[1]

9. We maintain the same judgment concerning that part of the *Liber Conformitatum* which relates to St Antony.[2] This collection, made by Bartholomew Albizzi of Pisa in 1385, received the approval of the Chapter-General of Assisi in 1399, and this gave it great official authority. But, considering the details that he introduced into certain miracles related in the *Liber Miraculorum*, as well as by Surius, we cannot consider this book reliable evidence, and we have only consulted it with a certain amount of justifiable mistrust.

Such are the earliest and the most important sources which we have consulted. Our readers will have noticed that other documents have been used in our account of the Saint: in quoting from them we have always endeavoured to be impartial in our estimation of them. We shall not give here a detailed account of the literature connected with St Antony from the fifteenth century up to our time. We shall merely state, with regard to this literature in general, what we have already said in referring to the particular authors who composed it: it is not to be relied on, because St Antony's biographers were simply desirous of giving a complete life, whatever happened, and so they were eager to obtain all new information concerning him without having the courage to examine it. We except from this statement two writers, Azzoguidi and Azevedo. But, nevertheless, they are not credible witnesses. The second writer, especially, coming after Missaglia, copied him, without seeing the necessity of putting him to an examination. Still, his work, enriched with innumerable dissertations, seems to us indispensable to anybody who desires to make researches concerning St Antony.

In our own time a large number of biographies of the Saint have been published: they merely copy, and summarise, the work of Azevedo without adding anything new to our knowledge. Or, as is more frequently the case, the second writer recapitulates or amplifies with great solemnity, and with baseless conjectures, what the preceding writer has said. When such is the case it is difficult to make any advance in our knowledge of the Saint.

---

[1] *Cf.* p. 3, note 2. The edition we have made use of is that of 1618.

[2] *Cf.* p. 62, note 2.

We except from this statement the following works. We place in the first rank the articles by Dr Edward Lempp in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Brieger, Gotha. They are written with knowledge and critical judgment by a Protestant clergyman who endeavours to be impartial, and have opened up a new era in the criticism of St Antony. We think it our duty to acknowledge the great service these articles have rendered us.

In his monograph entitled *S. Antonio di Padova i suoi tempi*, M. Enrico Salvagnini shows himself a partial writer, and lacks moreover critical judgment in everything relating to the *life* of the Saint. But his book is interesting because of the information it gives us about Padua and Italy in the earlier part of that century. Finally, M. de Mandach, from one particular point of view, has thrown light upon our subject in his beautiful book, *Saint Antoine de Padoue et l'art italien*. Such studies as these advance our historical knowledge, and we hope that his example may find numerous imitators.

II

We think it necessary to add some bibliographical details concerning the works attributed to St Antony. They complete what we have just given as to the sources for his biography. They enable us to appreciate better what has been said about the Saint's preaching, and finally they warn those readers who are not acquainted with the bibliography of St Antony against regrettable errors.

There were, from the sixteenth century onwards, several incomplete editions of the works of the Saint; that for example brought out by Badius Ascensius, probably at Paris, 1520, the *Sermones Dominicales sive de Tempore*, the one which Giannantonio Bertani published at Venice in 1574, with the sermons on the gospels for the whole year; and that containing the sermons on the gospels for Lent, published in Venice, 1575, by Father Raffaele Maffei. It appears, however, that all these editions are spurious. Therefore we will not concern ourselves longer with them.

The best known edition of St Antony's works is the one brought out by Father J. de la Haye, Paris, 1641, and Lyons, 1653. We have before us the Lyons edition, published by Pierre Rigaud. We find there the following works:—

1. *Concordantiae morales Sacrorum Bibliorum*. This is a very

curious kind of concordance, unknown in these days, and yet very interesting and really useful. The author indicates the various passages in Scripture which might be used in working out a given subject. This book, in the judgment of critics, was not by our Saint.

2. *Interpretatio mystica in Sacram Scripturam.* There is nothing to prove that this is to be attributed to St Antony.

3. and 4. *Sermones Dominicales and Sermones de Sanctis.* In these two collections the sermons are either wrongly taken down, or are not authentic. We must give here some explanation of the test adopted almost unanimously to prove whether the sermons attributed to St Antony are really by him. There is preserved in Padua in the case containing the Saint's relics a parchment manuscript which from the end of the thirteenth century has been regarded as a relic, and as such carried in the procession. There is no title to it, and it is clear that it has been torn off, as well as the marginal notes. A note written on the first page which was still to be seen, it appears in 1439, but which has long since vanished, indicated that the book had been composed and used by the Saint. This same note added: "The tradition of our forefathers informs me that the remarks added to this work were written by the glorious St Antony's own hand, and one may see many leaves have been torn out through love of the Saint." We are indebted for all these details to Azevedo, whose criticisms, it must be admitted, are often very poor.[1] It is this codex from the reliquary which has served as a means of judging all the manuscripts and all the printed books which have been given to us under the name of St Antony. If its authenticity is not certain, it is at least very probable.

The Conventual Franciscans of Padua possess in the Library of St Antony two other manuscripts, the contents of which are the same as those in the last-named manuscript, according to Father Josa.[2] Azevedo, however, maintains that they deviate in places from this manuscript, and contain various alterations and interpolations.

---

[1] Azevedo, *op. cit.*, pp. 429-439, Dissert. 45.

[2] *I Codici Manoscritti*, p. 26. Father Josa points out however that the MS. of the *Sermones festivi*, after the sermons reputed authentic, also gives a good number of fragments which do not coincide with the text of the relic.

This being admitted, we must now form a judgment concerning the sermons of St Antony that have been published.

A. Pagi published at Avignon in 1684 a volume entitled *S. Antonii Patavini Sermones de Sanctis et de diversis.* Critics are not agreed as to the authenticity of this work: Dr E. Lempp thinks that it is in conformity with the manuscript in the reliquary.

Father Josa brought out in 1885 at Padua, *Sermones S. Antonii de Padua in laudem Gloriosae Virginis Mariae*, and in 1883 at Bologna, with the two legends of St Antony, of which we have already discussed the authenticity, the *Sermones in Solemnitatibus Ascensionis*, etc. These two publications were taken from the manuscript in the reliquary.

Lastly D. Locatelli has begun a splendid publication of the *Sermones Dominicales et in Solemnitatibus.* He does not tell us what manuscripts he has used, and all our efforts to find this out from him have failed. However, two of our friends assured us that he used the manuscript in the reliquary, those in the library of St Antony, and two others with which they are not acquainted. We hope that when the work is finished the author will give us the long desired information.

In our account of St Antony's preaching we were not able to consult Pagi's edition which we could not procure anywhere. We used those of Father Josa and D. Locatelli for getting a general impression. But we thought it wise to take our quotations from Father Josa alone.

5. Finally Azzoguidi, in a work which we have quoted, has given us *Sermones in Psalmos*, which he attributes to St Antony (Bologna, 1757).[1] This is less a collection of sermons than a series of lessons on the psalms. In matter as in form this work bears a certain resemblance to the Saint's discourses; but we ought to have conclusive proofs before we regard it as authentic, and the author does not give us any.

In short, we are still very much in the dark in all matters relating to the bibliography of St Antony's works, and we shall ever welcome with delight the labours of those who help us towards enlightenment.

---

[1] This work has been re-edited by Horoy, *Mediiaevi Bibliotheca Patristica*, ser. I., vol. vi., pp. 555, *et sqq.* Paris, 1880.

"THE SAINTS" SERIES

1. **THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE SAINTS.** By Henri Joly.
2. **S. AUGUSTINE.** By Prof. Ad. Hatzfeld.
3. **S. VINCENT DE PAUL.** By Prince Emmanuel de Broglie.
4. **S. CLOTILDA.** By Prof. G. Kurth.
5. **S. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA.** By Henri Joly.
6. **S. LOUIS.** By Marius Sepet.
7. **S. AMBROSE.** By the Duc de Broglie.
8. **S. FRANCIS OF SALES.** By A. de Margerie.
9. **S. JEROME.** By the Rev. Father Largent.
10. **S. NICHOLAS.** By Jules Roy.
11. **JOAN OF ARC.** By L. Petit de Julleville.
12. **S. DOMINIC.** By Jean Guiraud.
13. **S. CHRYSOSTOM.** By Aimé Puech.
14. **S. ANTONY OF PADUA.** By the Abbé Albert Lepitre.

In preparation.

S. GAETANO. By R. de Maulde la Clavire.

PRINTED BY
TURNBULL AND SPEARS
EDINBURGH

3095